EEM
Wagstaffe, Thomas.

A VINDICATION OF King CHARLES the Martyr, Proving that His MAJESTY WAS THE AUTHOR OF ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ. Against a *MEMORANDUM*, Said to be Written by The EARL of ANGLESEY: AND Against the EXCEPTIONS of Dr. *Walker*, and Others.

The Second Edition, with Additions.

Imprimatur.
Junii 8. 1693.
CHARLES HERON.

LONDON:
Printed for *H. Hindmarsh*, at the *Golden-Ball* over against the *Royal Exchange*. 1697.

UMI

A VINDICATION OF King CHARLES I. &c.

THIS of late is become a Controverſie and hath exerciſed ſeveral Pens: and the Province I have undertaken, is to digeſt the whole into as plain and familiar a Method as I am able, to repreſent the Exceptions fairly, and to anſwer them, to add to, illuſtrate and confirm what I conceive needs it, to ſum up the Evidence on both ſides, and to compare them, and to make ſuch Remarks as plainly ariſe from the Reſpective Evidence; and by that time I have done this, it will, I preſume, be very eaſie for the Reader to determine the Controverſie, and to aſſign the true Author of this Book, and repudiate the falſe one, and Pretender.

In order to this, I ſhall in the firſt place conſider a *Memorandum*, ſaid to be written by my Lord of *Angleſey*, in a vacant Page of one of theſe Printed Books, which is in theſe words,

MEMORANDUM.

King Charles *the Second, and the Duke of* York *did both (in the laſt Seſſion of Parliament* 1675, *when I ſhewed them in the Lords Houſe, the written Copy of this Book, wherein are ſome Corrections, written with the late King* Charles *the Firſt's own Hand*) *aſſure me, that this was none of the ſaid King's compiling, but made by Doctor* Gauden, *Biſhop of* Exeter, *which I here inſert for the undeceiving others in this Point, by atteſting ſo much under my Hand:* Angleſey.

To this it hath already been anſwered, That both the ſaid Kings have atteſted the contrary by their *Letters Patents* to Mr. *Royſton*, granting him the ſole Privilege to Print all the Works of King *Charles* the Firſt. Thoſe of King *Charles* the Second bear Date, *Nov.* 29. 1660, and expreſly mention the Fidelity of Mr. *Royſton* to King *Charles* the Firſt, and to himſelf, and in theſe remarkable Words; *In Printing and Publiſhing many Meſſages and Papers of our ſaid Bleſſed Father, eſpecially thoſe moſt excellent Diſcourſes and Soliloquies, by the Name of εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ.* Thoſe of King *James* bear date *Febr.* 22. 1685, and expreſly refer to the firſt Edition of the King's Works, 1662, in which his Majeſty declares, That *all the Works of his Royal Father were Collected and Publiſhed.* Now a Man would imagine, that there could not be any poſſible Diſpute, which was to be preferr'd, a Publick and Authoritative Atteſtation of the Kings themſelves, or a private *Memor:* by a third perſon. For the immediate Queſtion here is not *Who was the Author of this Book?* But who was ſo in the *Opinion* and *Judgment* of thoſe two Kings? And I would fain know, Whether the Teſtimony of my Lord of *Angleſey* is a better proof of their Sence and Judgment, than their own Teſtimony; or a private, obſcure, unatteſted, poſthumous *Handwriting*, a more valid Evidence, than the *Broad Seals*? And this, one would think abundantly ſufficient to determine this part of the Controverſie, that is, that a Man's Word is to be taken for his own Senſe and Opinion before that of his Neighbours, and that high and authoritative Evidence is always to carry the Cauſe in oppoſition to that which is no Evidence at all.

However (as clear as this is) Dr. *Walker* hath ſomething to ſay to it, tho, I think ſtranger Anſwers were never given in ſuch a Caſe. And in the firſt place he tells us, *Pag.* 28. That *good Manners rather than want of good Reaſons reſtrain him from fuller anſwering:* meaning, I preſume, that theſe Kings did not ſpeak truth, tho' he would not ſay ſo; and accordingly he ſays afterwards, *it was but conniving at a vulgar Error, which it was not their Intereſt too nicely to diſcover.* Now this Anſwer plainly gives up the Cauſe it pretends to maintain; for if it was *not their Intereſt to diſcover it*, how came they both ſo frankly to tell it to my Lord of *Angleſey?* and as the *Memorandum* ſpeaks, *they both did aſſure him, that it was none of the ſaid King's Compiling*; and that, I think, is a little more than a *nice* Diſcovery, even a very plain and peremptory aſſurance. So that if this be an Anſwer to the *Letters Patents*,

tents, 'tis equally ſo to the *Memorandum*. And the ſame Intereſt, I ſuppoſe, which kept it a *Secret* from the whole Kingdom, would have kept it a *Secret* from my Lord of *Angleſey* too, eſpecially conſidering that it was not only far more eaſie, but alſo far more honourable, to have concealed a matter of Fact within their Knowledge, than to have wrongfully atteſted it, and contrary to their Knowledge, under the Great Seal of *England*.

But notwithſtanding that, Dr. *Walker* in further purſuit of this ſcandalous Anſwer tells us, that this is *Odioſum Argumentum deſigned not for real proof, but to involve the Anſwerer in ſome Odium or Danger, and which Reſpondents may diſmiſs unreplyed to, not becauſe they cannot, but becauſe they dare not anſwer it.* Why, what was the matter? what *Danger* was there in reflecting on thoſe two Kings, had the Doctor ſpoke out, and in expreſs Terms declared his Mind? Was he afraid to be called to account, and puniſhed for it? A Man that reads this would imagine, that the Doctor was a perfect Stranger in his own Country, and that he wrote his Book in ſome remote Corner of the World. But when he daily heard the vileſt things ſpoke of thoſe two Kings (eſpecially one of them) that ever were ſaid, not only of Kings, but of the worſt of Men; when a great part of this paſs'd into the World not by ſtealth or connivance, but under the Authority of a *Licenſe*, and in truth ſeemed meritorious; in ſuch a caſe to talk of *Odium*, and *Danger*, and *Fear*, is to ſcorn his Readers, and to ſuppoſe they had all loſt their Senſes. And therefore in plain terms the Doctor did not know how fairly to anſwer this, and created imaginary and inviſible *Odiums* and *Dangers*, to get rid of an Argument he could not tell what to do with.

However, in the next place, the Doctor anſwers, That *Kings uſe not ſo critically to inſpect all the minute Particulars of their general Royal Grants.* Meaning, no doubt, that the εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ was ſuch a *minute Particular*, as needed great *Criticalneſs* to find it out among the reſt, whereas all the World knows what a mighty Figure that Book bears among the renowned Works of that Glorious Martyr. And the Truth is, this Anſwer plainly inſinuates, that thoſe two Kings knew nothing at all of this Book's being inſerted among the reſt of their Father's Works; and accordingly he tells us, that *an Under-Secretary or Clerk, who drew the Patents, put in what Mr.* Royſton *reckoned up, and deſired; and never boggled at inſerting it among King* Charles's *Works.* Now this is ſuch an

Anſwer,

Anſwer, that to reply to it, would be as ſhameleſs as to urge it, and would equally reproach the Reader; for if the Doctor himſelf either did or could ſuppoſe, or if any other Man can ſuppoſe, that theſe two Kings did not believe that this Book was inſerted among the reſt, nay, that they could poſſibly believe, but that it was deſign'd as a main and principal part, which for ſo many years bore their Father's Name, and was more known and taken notice of than any of the reſt, it is high time to leave diſputing, or to convince Men by rational Motives of Credibility: and let this hereafter go for a Rule, that the beſt way to gain belief, is to propound the moſt incredible things in the World. For if any man who knows the ſtate of this Matter, the current Senſe of this Kingdom, and the general Eſtimation concerning the Author of that Book, can believe, that theſe two Kings did not think, or could otherwiſe than think that it would be inſerted among their Father's Works. That Man may believe any thing, and if he will take this for an Anſwer, there is nothing how impoſſible or incredible ſoever, but he may give his aſſent to. So that let it be granted, that Kings do not always critically examine the Tranſcript of their Royal Grants, except they neglected their Memories and Underſtandings, and left them alſo to *Under-Secretaries and Clerks*: it is not poſſible for any Man to believe, but that they knew that their Father was univerſally acknowledged and reputed for the Author of that Book, and conſequently, that a Grant to Reprint his Works, muſt of neceſſity include that, altho it had not been particularly expreſſed in the Grant it ſelf. But when this excellent Book is not only particularly expreſſed, but mentioned alſo with particular Characters and Marks of Recommendation, to talk of *Critical Inſpection*, and of *Under-Secretaries* and *Clerks*, is to ſuppoſe, that *Under-Secretaries and Clerks* make Royal Grants, and not Kings themſelves.

However, the Doctor adds, *What underſtanding Man believes all the other particular Pieces, which make up the whole Volume of the King's Works, to be originally penned by himſelf, but knows many of them were prepared by his Secretaries and Council, and then peruſed and approved of by him, and ſo became his, by adding the Royal Stamp of his Approbation, and owning of them; and the ſame was deſigned in this Book.* Very good, then

1. It ſeems Things *prepared by Secretaries and Council* become the King's by his *Peruſal and approving* them; and ſo I hope do *Letters Patents* too; and therefore let the *Grants* to Mr. *Royſton* be drawn by what *Under-Secretary or Clerk* the Doctor

Doctor pleaſes, if they came to be the acts of the reſpective Kings, by their *Peruſal and Approbation of them*, then it is plain they teſtified their *Royall Father* was the Author of this Book, and ſo the Doctor both contradicts and confutes himſelf.

2. When the Doctor's Hand was in, I wonder he did not tell us, that the Papers of Mr. *Henderſon* to the King, and the Particulars inſiſted on by the Parliaments Commiſſioners at the Treaty at *Uxbridge*, were not originally penned by the King, and which are inſerted in the Volume of the King's Works. And this would have been a plain Caſe, and muſt needs have been granted him. And what then? Why then by the Doctor's way of arguing, neither the King's Papers to Mr. *Henderſon*, nor his Papers about *Epiſcopacy* were originally penned by him; or that becauſe theſe two Kings did not believe, that thoſe things inſerted in the King's Works [as relating to them] which bear the Name of other Authors, were not of his own penning therefore they believed, that the Writing which bears his own Name, was not penned by him neither, altho they mention it as written by himſelf. Theſe are pleaſant Conſequenſes.

3. Be it granted that *Proclamations* and ſuch things are originally penned by Secretaries, and become the King's, by adding his Royal Authority; what is this to *Books*? *Proclamations* are really the King's Acts, becauſe they derive their Validity and Authority from *Him*, whoever pens them. But *Books* are quite of another nature; no *Royall Stamp* can make a *Book* the King's own, which he did not pen himſelf. And therefore thoſe Atteſtations in the *Royall Grants* concerning the *Works* of the Royal Martyr, are to be underſtood according to the nature of things, that is they atteſt the reſpective parts of that Volume were his Works, in that ſenſe in which they were *his Works*. *Proclamations*, *&c.* were his by adding his Authority, and they were the ſame Acts of the King to all purpoſes of Law, whether penned by himſelf, or by his Secretaries. But a *Book* in no ſenſe can be ſaid to be the King's, of which he is not the Author. And therefore theſe two Kings atteſting, that this *Book* was their *Royal Father's*, it plainly means, in that ſenſe in which a *Book* is ſaid to be ſo, and that is, not by adopting it by conſent and approbation, but by penning and writing it. And it is a pleaſant Conſequence indeed, *Proclamations* are the King's by his conſent and authority whoever pens them, and therefore *Books* that bear his Name are ſo too. Well! No body knows what a ſtrange thing Reaſon is, when it falls into the Hands of ſome Men.

The

The Doctor ſtill adds, *Admit Mr.* Royſton *had obtained a Patent for the ſole Printing the Works of King* David, *and had got it explicitly inſerted, all the Works of King* David, *that is, the whole Book of* Pſalms, *containing in number one hundred and fifty, would it have followed hence, that he who granted this Patent, had publiſhed to all the World that he knew and believed, that* David *was the real Penman of them all, tho ſome of them were certainly written ſome Ages after* David's *Death.* No truly, it would not have *followed*, nor does it follow from the Grant of theſe Kings to Reprint their Father's Works, that therefore they believed the King was the real Penman of Mr. *Henderſon*'s Papers. But (by the Doctor's good favour) this would have followed, that if King *Solomon* had granted a Patent to Collect or Print (had Printing been then in uſe) his Father's Pſalms, and had expreſly and eſpecially mentioned three or four as his Fathers, it is plain, that he muſt be underſtood to believe, that theſe were penned by his Father.

Having thus diſpatched Dr. *Walker*'s Anſwers, I have yet ſomething farther to obſerve concerning this *Memorandum*; and which ſeems ſufficient to overthrow the Validity of it: and that which I ſhall obſerve is taken from the *Memorandum* it ſelf. Intrinſick proof taken from things themſelves is generally the moſt clear and convincing; Frauds and Impoſtures are ſeldom managed with ſuch art and exactneſs, but a diſcerning Eye may eaſily diſcover them; and in this *Memorandum* there are ſome obſervable Circumſtances that make it highly liable to ſuſpicion, I mean, that it was never made by my Lord of *Angleſey*, but forged by ſome other perſon for the very ends for which it hath been ſo often produced; now if this *Memorandum* be defective in ſome Points, that are very material in a thing of this Nature, if it diſcovers a great faultineſs, with reſpect to the very end for which it was pretended to be made, then it is apparantly unworthy of the Prudence and Foreſight of my Lord of *Angleſey*, and deſerves to be aſcribed to ſome other Author. For the proof of this, I ſhall take my meaſures from the laſt Words of the *Memorandum*, which plainly declare the end for which it was made, and for that reaſon declare that it was not made, nor ſign'd by the ſaid Lord. The Words are theſe: *Which I here inſert for the undeceiving others in this Point, by atteſting ſo much under my Hand.* Now here are theſe things obſervable, and which in every reſpect make this *Memorandum* defective and inſufficient for the attaining this end.

1. It

1. It bears no Date.

2. It is not attested by any Witness.

3. It was the most unlikely course to answer the ends of the *Memorandum* it self.

4. There is no appearance that this was said to any other Person.

1. it bears no Date, and that in a double respect.

1. With respect to the exact time when the *King* and the *Duke* gave the Lord of *Anglesey* this *Assurance*. It says indeed, *in the last Sessions of Parliament*, 1675. But this is expressed very ambiguously, and the Question is, whether by *last Session* the *Memorandum* means the *last* before the writing the *Memorandum*, or with respect to it, or the *last Sessions* of that year. If the *last* with respect to the writing of the *Memorandum*, then we are not directed by the *Memorandum* when that *Session* was; for it self having no Date, we have no possible means to know the time of that *Session*. And it is not only unaccurate upon all accounts, but abundantly faulty in a Testimonial of this Nature, to direct us to a determinate time, when such Words were spoken, and yet leave the World utterly in the dark, when that time was, *i. e.* in short, these Words were spoken no body knows when, and (as the Case stands) it is impossible they ever should know. *i.e.* 'Tis plainly a suspicious Evidence, as giving Testimony to a matter of Fact, without fixing any determinate time in which it was perform'd. But if the *Memorandum* had been more punctual in this particular, and had given a handle to have known what particular Sessions was meant; or if by the *last Session* is to be understood the *last* of that year. This is also liable to considerable Inconvenience, as being a space of time too large and loose, to found a competent Evidence upon, a *Session of Parliament* may continue five, six, or seven Months. And so we have a matter of Fact fastened to the compass of an hundred, two hundred, or more days. A pleasant Evidence indeed, and much to be relyed on; every Man knows what great Weight there is in the Circumstance of time with respect to the Credibility of any Testimony. And if the compass be laid large and wide, it is an argument of great suspicion, especially if the Matter said to be done, was at no great distance from the time of giving this Evidence: if a Man within a year or sooner, should evidence in Court, that such a Fact was done in Parliament, during such a Session, and at the same time could not tell whether it was at the beginning, about the middle, or towards the latter end of that Session, and withal

being himſelf a Member of Parliament, and actually ſitting, I would fain know whether this be not a juſt and reaſonable Prejudice againſt the competency of ſuch Evidence; now this *Memorandum* plainly labours under this Prejudice, and which is yet more, it can never be removed, becauſe there are no poſſible ways left to explain it, or to bring it into a narrower compaſs of time, as all unexceptionable Evidence ought to be; and therefore I ſhall leave it to the conſideration of all wiſe men, whether they can believe that a perſon of my Lord of *Angleſey*'s Prudence and Caution would tranſmit to Poſterity, and with a deſign too to undeceive others, ſuch a *Memorandum* as is ſo palpably defective, and liable to juſt exception, in ſuch a material point as plainly relates to the validity of any Evidence; for this I take to be Demonſtration, that if my Lord of *Angleſey* had himſelf *viva voce* given all the words of this *Memorandum* in Evidence, and at the ſame time had not been able to anſwer the foregoing Queſtions, whether theſe Words of King *Charles* and his Royal Brother were ſpoken about the beginning, the middle, or the end of that Seſſion? If this had been a juſt Prejudice againſt ſuch Evidence given by my Lord of *Angleſey* himſelf, it is certainly much more ſo againſt a Paper pretended to be written and ſigned by him, which is guilty of the ſame defects. And I think no reaſon can be given that a Paper *Memorandum*, with the Name of my Lord of *Angleſey* to it, is a more valid and authentic Evidence, than my Lord of *Angleſey* himſelf would have been.

2. As this *Memorandum* gives us no determinate time when theſe Words were ſpoken, ſo likewiſe has it no date when the *Memorandum* it ſelf was written. And this is a fine Evidence indeed to determine Controverſies, and *undeceive others*; which for the matter pretended to be proved has a very looſe date; and for it ſelf hath no date at all, and both begins and ends like a fabulous ſtory with *once upon a time*. The truth is, this *Memorandum* is penn'd as if there was fear of having it diſprov'd; had the day been named when the King and the Duke of *York* had ſaid this, perhaps by ſome unlucky Circumſtance or other it might have appeared, that one or both of them together (which was very rare) were not at the houſe that day. Had the *Memorandum* been punctually dated, ſomething might have happened to have prov'd that my Lord of *Angleſey* was at that time travelling, or in the Country from his Study, or otherwiſe unlikely to have made ſuch a *Memorandum* at that time. And therefore it was far better to let dates alone as dangerous things, and apt to tell Tales.

And to this may be added: 2. That

2. That this *Memorandum* is unatteſted by any Witneſs, and (as the Caſe ſtands) it is impoſſible it ſhould be, except there were one or more Perſons who ſaw my Lord of *Angleſey* write or ſign it. Now I need not urge the neceſſity of *Witneſs* to prove the ſigning of a *Memorandum* that pretends to correct the World, and to undeceive others, and that, upon the ſingle Credit and Authority of that *Memorandum*; every man knows that an unatteſted Paper is no Evidence, and that a Man's *Hand* when he is dead, except it be well prov'd, ſignifies nothing at all, nor can have any effect: And the World muſt be very willing to be *undeceived* indeed, if they will alter their Judgments and Opinions upon that which neither is, nor ever was admitted to be any Evidence, nor ſufficient to determine the leaſt matter of Controverſie. And therefore upon the whole, if my Lord of *Angleſey* had made this *Memorandum* for his own private uſe, it might have done well enough, becauſe the defects of it might have been ſupply'd by his own Memory; but when it was deſign'd for the uſe of Poſterity, to *undeceive* others when he was dead, to leave it ſo defective in all the neceſſary parts of Proof is irrational and unaccountable, and conſequently is not to be aſcrib'd to a perſon of his Lordſhips Character and Judgment, and great knowledg in the Laws: For my Lord (had he wrote this) could not but know that this matter would be diſputed, and the *Memorandum* plainly implies it, and that nothing leſs then plain and unexceptionable Proof would convince the World; and at the ſame time to leave behind him a ſuſpicious and inevident *Memorandum*, which may crea'e ſome Diſputes but can end none, is unworthy of his Lordſhip, and ought not without manifeſt Proof to be father'd upon him, nor indeed can be without ſome reflection upon his Lordſhips Memory. And therefore:

3. This was the moſt improbable, and unlikely courſe that could be taken to anſwer thoſe ends mentioned in the *Memorandum*, (viz) to *undeceive others*: For (beſides what hath been ſaid before) what a pure Method is this to correct publick Miſtakes, and to undeceive the World, to lodge a *Memorandum* in a vacant page of a Book, never to be ſeen till after his death; and then alſo liable to a thouſand Contingencies, to be torn, to fall into private hands, to lie neglected and never ſee the light: For I ſuppoſe his Lordſhip could never divine that his Study of Books would be ſold by Auction, and that Mr. *Milling'on* would make the Sale. So that for any thing his Lordſhip either did or could know, the World might never have been *undeceiv'd*; & it is an extraordinary caution indeed to take

pains to *undeceive* others, and at the ſame time leave them in a hopeful way never to be the better for it; had there been no other way, ſuch a one as this muſt have ſhifted as well as it could but when Men have Tongues in their Mouths, and may clear up miſtakes by living and undoubted Teſtimony, to commit it to a bit of paper, and that alſo laid up in darkneſs and obſcurity, ſeems far from that Zeal to Truth which this *Memorandum* pretends to, and for which end it pretends to have been written: had my Lord of *Angleſey*, (think we) no Friends, Acquaintance or Children to have communicated this to? And where, I wonder, is the Man who ever heard my Lord ſay this, or any thing like it? There can, as I know of, but one thing be ſaid to this, and that is, that there might be ſome danger in ſo doing; and that this, tho it was not the ſecureſt, yet it was the ſafeſt way. But this, is obviated by the *Memorandum* it ſelf, which plainly intimates that the two Kings made no Secret of it themſelves, nor injoyn'd him any Secreſie, but frankly and freely aſſur'd him, which (as it is worded in the *Memorandom*) ſeems to expreſs a deſign to have it ſpread and propagated; and therefore if the *Memorandum* be true, there could be no Reſervedneſs and Caution upon that account, or fear of any Diſpleaſure from the King or his Royal Brother. Now indeed it muſt be owned, that to rectifie Miſtakes and to ſet the World right, is a generous and charitable Undertaking; but at the ſame time to neglect the direct and unexceptionable means to do this without reaſon and neceſſity, and to perform it in the dark, and expoſe it to manifeſt hazard and uncertainty and after all to leave it without *Date* or *Witneſs*, ſo as in no degree to amount to a competent Evidence, in plain terms is to *deceive others* inſtead of *undeceiving* them; and in truth the *Memorandum* is a Contradiction it ſelf, the End of it is expreſs'd to be to *undeceive others*, and yet the *Memorandum* it ſelf is the moſt unlikely courſe that could be taken to accompliſh that End; and eſpecially when there were ſeveral other far better at hand. Upon all which Accounts I do conclude, that this *Memorandum* was not made by my Lord of *Angleſey*, but by ſome other hand, to deceive and impoſe upon the World. And certain I am that whoſoever inſiſts upon this *Memorandum* is bound to do theſe two things: 1. To prove that this was my Lord of *Angleſey*'s Hand-writing. And 2. To give a ſatisfactory Reaſon why my Lord of *Angleſey* forbore to declare this by Word of mouth, which the *Memorandum* intimates was ſo openly and freely, and without any Reſerve declared to him, And when it was by a thouſand degrees more fit to anſwer the ends expreſs'd in the

Memorandum.

Memorandum. And this hath not yet been attempted, and I preſume can never fairly be done. And to this I add.

4. That there is no Appearance nor ſo much as Preſumption that the two Royal Brothers ever ſaid this to any other Perſon. This I confeſs is a *Negative*, but I ſhall leave it with all the World, whether if this was their conſtant and ſtanding judgment it is by any means probable, that they would not one time or other have declared the ſame to ſome other Perſons, when they had done it with ſuch openneſs and unreſervedneſs to my Lord of *Angleſey*, and conſequently that we ſhould have heard of it from ſome other quarter, and in ſome better manner, than by ſuch a blind *Memorandum*.

And for a yet more full confirmation I ſhall add.

5. That there is now in my hands a very conſiderable Teſtimony proving not only that K. *Charles* the 2*d.* beleiv'd that his Father was the Author of this Book, but that he had one of them wrot with the Kings own hand, together with ſome Letters from him concerning it. It is a Letter from Dr. *Canaries*, which for the Readers ſatisfaction I ſhall inſert at large, and leave it with him as accumulative Evidence.

SIR,

The Account which I promiſed you concerning King *Charles* the Firſt's Book is this. *In the year* 1650 *the* Scots *ſent Commiſſioners to King* Charles *the* 2d. *then at* Breda, *in order to adjuſt all matters with him about the Covenant, before they would admit him to the exerciſe of his Royal Government: And that both the Kirk and the State might look to their reſpective Intereſts each of them ſent their own Commiſſioners.* Mr. James Wood, *one of the Miniſters of St.* Andrews, *and Provoſt (or Principal) of the old Colledge in that Univerſity, and one of the moſt learned and conſiderable Perſons amongſt all the Presbiterian Miniſters then in that Kingdom, was one of the Commiſſioners ſent by the Kirk. He being one day in the King's Bedchamber when He was at* Breda, *The King began a diſcourſe about his Father's Book, ſeveral Perſons of Quality being preſent, and after a little he turned to* Mr. Wood, *and ſaid to him,* Mr. Wood, *I hear that ſome are pleaſed to ſay that my Father was not the Author of that Book; but it is no great wonder that thoſe, who have been ſo injurious to him upon all other reſpects, ſhould not ſpare his Memory in an affair of this nature, however I will let you ſee how great a Calumny this is. Whereupon the King took* Mr. Wood

into

into his Closet with him and there he shew'd him the whole Book written all in his Father's hand, together with a Letter from his Father concerning it to him: then the King said, But Mr. Wood *that you may not entertain any scruple about the hand, here are several of my Father's Letters to me, all written in his own hand, take any of them, and compare the hands together. So* Mr. Wood *compar'd the hands, and then said to the King; that he was fully convinc'd, that the Book and the Letter about it, were all written in his Father's hand, upon which the King said to him, Now* Mr. Wood *I appeal to you, whether or not my Father would have ever written over a Book, that was not his own, and have sent such a Letter to me about it.* Mr. Wood *answer'd that he was highly oblig'd to his* Majesty *for the honour he had done him, in having shew'd him such an Authentical proof of his Father's being the Author of that Book: he had indeed heard that some persons did question it; but now he was so perswaded of the truth of it that he thought himself oblig'd in conscience to do the King his Father justice, by vindicating his* Memory *in that point, as he should have any occasion for doing it.*

After Mr. Wood *return'd to* Scotland, *he told my Father the whole passage with all its circumstances so as it is here related; there having been a great intimacy between my Father and him for many years before. And withall he told him that he was as much convinc'd that King* Charles *the First was the Author of that Book, as he could be that one was the Author of a Book which he had not seen him write. This account I had many times from my Father; and in the Words and Circumstances wherein I have set it down, as near as I can possibly remember. And sure I am that my Father could never have had any design to tell me such a story, and so frequently, and in his private conversation with me, if he had not had it as punctually from* Mr. Wood *himself: besides that as my Father was a Minister, so he was known by all that knew him to be a man of most entire integrity, and reputation. And it is no less certain that* Mr. Wood *would never have told such a thing to my Father, if it had not been really true;* Mr. Wood, *tho' a* Presbyterian, *being a person of great Candour and honesty, besides that it is not possible to imagine what design he could have had to have invented such a Story, and to have imposed it upon my Father under the terms of the greatest intimacy with him. For my part, I do as verily beleive the truth of it as I can beleive the truth of a thing that I did not see with my own eyes, having it so immediately conveyed to*

me

me, and conveyed too by ſuch perſons, and in ſuch a manner. And as what concerns my ſhare in this Teſtimony namely that I had it ſo from my Father, I am ready to depoſe it upon oath before any Court of Judicature in the world, whenſoever I ſhould be called to do it. And Sir, I allow you to make any uſe of this you ſhall think convenient.

I am Sir

Your moſt humble Servant

Abingdon in *Berks*, *James Canaries.*
July 17th. 1693.

I have now done with this *Memorandum*, and do conceive, That I have vindicated the Memory of King *Charles* I. and his Right to this Book from any Exceptions that can be taken from thence: I ſhall therefore proceed to ſome further evidence to convince the unbyaſs'd and unprejudiced, that that glorious *Martyr* actually was, and that no other could be, the Author of it. Now whereas Evidence is of two Kinds; *external*, which relates to outward Teſtimony, and *internal*, which is drawn from the thing it ſelf; both theſe are plain in the Caſe, and will ſufficiently clear up the point before us.

1. External Evidence, *i. e.* the Teſtimony of other credible Witneſſes to the truth of it: But that I may deal fairly, I ſhall ſum up the evidence on both ſides, and then leave it to the Readers Judgment; only I muſt premiſe, that King *Charles* I. being in poſſeſſion and for ſo many years reputed and acknowledged for the Author of this Book, whatſoever is offered to defeat his title to it ought to be very plain, clear, and ſatisfactory, and to overballance the contrary Evidence in point of Credibility and Sufficiency: For an Equality of Evidence can never do it, becauſe Poſſeſſion preponderates, and will weigh down on that ſide, where all other circumſtances are equal. But if the Evidence on that ſide be more in number, and as credible, if further there be no juſt exceptions to the Evidence on that ſide, as having no perſonal Byaſs, Partiality or Intereſt to ſway them; and there be juſt exceptions to that of the other, there then can be no Diſpute which will carry the Cauſe. And this I take to be the Caſe here, and which I conceive will plainly appear upon comparing the Evidence, with reſpect the Claim of King *Charles* and Biſhop *Gauden* to this Book. And to conſider,

1. The Evidence that is produc'd for Biſhop *Gauden's* being the Author of it, and that in truth is included in a very narrow compaſs, and it is all finally reſolved into one ſingle Evidence,

Evidence, and that Evidence is Bishop *Gauden* himself. And this will appear upon a fair examining the respective Evidence that hath yet appeared on this side of the Question: And they are these two,

First, The Attestation of Dr. *Walker*. And *Secondly*, the Evidence of some Papers now in the hands of Mr. *North*.

First The Attestation of Dr. *Walker* and what he says is this in short. 1. *That* Dr. Gauden *sometime before the whole was finished acquainted him with his design, and shewed him the Heads of divers Chapters, and some of the Discourses written of them, and after some time spent in the perusal, he asked his Opinion concerning it; and he* (Dr. Walker) *told him he supposed it would be for the Kings Reputation, but he expresly added, he stuck at the Lawfulness of it, and asked him how he satisfied himself so to impose upon the World. To which he replyed; Look on the Title, 'tis the Pourtraicture* &c. *and no man draws his own Picture,* &c. *That he explained to him a Passage in the second Chapter, and that he meant it of* Dr. Juxton.

2. *That being both in* London, *in an Afternoon* Dr. Gauden *asked him to walk with him to a friend, and in the going told him he was going to the Bishop of* Salisbury Dr. Duppa, *(whom he had acquainted with his design) to fetch what he had left with his Lordship to be perused, or to shew him what he had further written.* That Dr. Gauden *desired him after a general Conversation to withdraw, which he did,* and that *upon return he told him, that my Lord of* Salisbury *told him there were two Subjects more he wish'd he had thought on, and propounded them, the Ordinance against the Common Prayer, and the denying his Majesty the attendance of his Chaplains, and desired him to write two Chapters upon them, which the Bishop recalled, and desired him to finish what remains and leave those two to him;* and that Dr. Gauden *did not pretend to have written those, as he did to have done all the rest.*

3. Upon Dr. *Walkers* asking Dr. *Gauden* (*after the King was murdered*) *whether the King had ever seen the Book,* Dr. Gauden *answered, I know it certainly no more than you, but I used my best Endeavours that he might, for I delivered a Copy of it to the Marques of* Hartford *when he went to the treaty at the* Isle *of* Wight, *and intreated his Lordship if he could obtain any private Opportunity, he would deliver it to his Majesty, and humbly desire to know his* Majesty's *Pleasure concerning it. But the violence which threatned the King hastning so fast, he ventured to print it, and never knew what was the issue of sending it, for when the thing was done, he judged it not prudent to make further noise about it by enquiry.*

4. Dr.

4. Dr. *Walker* asking him (And adds in a Parentheſis; *For we ſeldom were in private but ſomewhat was diſcourſed of this Book, even to the laſt time I ſaw him, after he was Lord Biſhop of* Worceſter *elect*) *whether King* Charles II. *knew that he wrote it. He anſwered, I cannot poſitively and certainly ſay he doth, becauſe he was never pleaſed to take expreſs notice of it to me; but I take it for granted he doth, for I am ſure the Duke of* York *doth, for he hath ſpoken of it to me, and owned it as a ſeaſonable and acceptable ſervice; and he knowing it, I queſtion not but the King alſo doth.*

5. *Mrs.* Gauden *the Doctor's Wife, Mr.* Gifford *and Dr.* Walker *believed it as much as they could believe any thing, and were as much aſſured of it as 'tis poſſible they could be of any matter of fact.*

6. *Dr.* Gauden *delivered to him with his own hand what was laſt ſent up, (after part was printed, or at leaſt in Mr.* Royſton's *hand to be printed) and after he had ſhew'd it him and ſealed it up, gave him caution to deliver it, which he did on* Saturday, Decemb. 23. 48. *in the Evening, according to direction, to one* Peacock, *(Brother to Dr.* Gauden's *Steward) who was inſtructed by what hands to deliver it to Mr.* Royſton, *and in the ſame manner after the Impreſſion was finiſh'd he received ſix Books by the hand of* Peacock *as an acknowledgment, and one of them he hath ſtill by him.*

This is the Sum of Dr. *Walker's* Evidence in this matter, out of which I ſhall at preſent only obſerve,

1. That all that is material in this Evidence is reſolved into the Teſtimony of Dr. *Gauden* himſelf, *viz.* That Dr. *Gauden acquainted him with his deſign*, that Dr. *Gauden* told him the Diſcourſe of the Biſhop of *Salisbury*, that Dr. *Gauden* told him *he did not certainly know* whether King *Charles* I. or King *Charles* II. knew that he wrote it, *&c.* The Validity of which I ſhall conſider when I come to the next Evidence that appears in this matter.

2. That what ſeems to be otherwiſe is of no Validity at all, nor can have any force with a rational and wiſe man. And that becauſe,

1. It only ſeems to be ſomething more, but in truth it is not, it is expreſs'd indeed as if Dr. *Walker* had given us ocular Teſtimony, that he had ſeen the Heads and ſome of the Diſcourſes; but this is very defective in a neceſſary and material point, and does not come up to any ſtrict Evidence: For altho he ſays that Dr. Gauden *ſhewed him the Heads of divers Chapters and ſome of the Diſcourſes written of them, and ſome time being ſpent in*

the perusal, yet that which should make this a Proof, that they were written by Dr. *Gauden*, is altogether wanting, and that is, that they were written with Dr. *Gauden's own hand*. This, which is the only material thing, there is not the least word of, and which in a matter of this nature ought not, nor reasonably could be omitted. And I think it is plain, either that Dr. *Walker* could say nothing to this, or that he knew they were not written with Dr. *Gauden*'s own hand, if the latter the Evidence is corrupt, if the former insignificant; and if there be any force in this part of the Evidence, it is not because Dr. *Walker* saw and perused the Heads and Discourses; for that he might do whether Dr. *Gauden* wrote them or not, but from those former Words, that *Dr.* Gauden *acquainted him with his Design*. And I take it to be very observable, that of that Evidence which hath yet appeared, there is not the least said that comes up to this point, that the original Manuscript was written by Dr. *Gauden*'s own hand; which to me is a plain Evidence that it was never written by him; for if such a thing had been, Dr. *Walker* living (as he says) in Dr. *Gauden*'s House, and being made so privy to it, and (as he says) perusing the Heads and some of the Discourses, and Mrs. *Gauden* (the Evidence of whose Papers I shall consider presently) must needs have known it; and I shall leave it to any considering man what value is to be put on such Evidence in such Circumstances, which pretends to prove that one Person is the Author of a Book in opposition to another more generally reputed Author, and at the same time never offers to prove, that that Book was written by himself, or by his immediate dictating, and direction. This sure is the direct Proof, and if it could be had, ought to have been produced, and the World must be very easie and credulous, if they will take the main point upon trust, and be put off with general Stories instead of that in which the Proof does consist. Is it possible for any man to believe that Mrs. *Gauden* did not know her Husbands Hand, or that Dr. *Walker*, did not know it? Or further, that Dr *Walker*, being so early acquainted with the Secret, should not know of the Progress made in that Work from time to time, or be able (upon Perusal) to discover some Interlinings or Alterations made by Dr. *Gauden*'s own Hand; In short, did any man ever see Dr. *Gauden* write it, or proceed with it, or add to and amend it? These and more we have, as Evidence for King *Charles*'s being the Author; and it is a pleasant business indeed that this plain and direct Evidence must be confronted by Collections and Inferences, and bold Asseverations, without any manner of Proof to the direct matter

matter in Controverſie. But this I ſhall further conſider, when I come to compare the Evidence on both ſides.

In the mean time:

2. This Evidence Dr. *Walker* hath contradicted himſelf in another Teſtimony of his in the hands of Dr. *Goodal*, and given *March* 23. 1690. Where among others are theſe Words, *Dr.* Walker *and Mr.* Gifford *were both privy to theſe Affairs, living together in the Biſhops Houſe, though the Doctor is uncertain whether he ever read this Book in Manuſcript, or only ſaw it with its Title of the Chapters*, which plainly croſſes and thwarts his Evidence in his printed Book, in which he expreſly atteſts, that *Dr.* Gauden *ſhew'd him the Heads of divers Chapters*, and that is not all; but it follows, *and ſome of the Diſcourſes written of them*: and if it had ended here, the Evidence might have agreed well enough; but it ſtill follows, *and after ſome time ſpent in the Peruſal*: ſo that it ſeems Dr. *Walker* had read *ſome of the Diſcourſes* at leaſt, & that not tranſiently, but *after ſome time ſpent in the Peruſal*. And in further Confirmation of this the Doctor adds; *And I perfectly remember, that in the ſecond Chapter, which is of the Death of the Earl of* Strafford, *there being theſe Words, which now in the Printed Book of the firſt Edition are* p. 8. l. 18, 19 20. He only hath been leaſt vext by them, who counſelled me not to conſent againſt the Vote of my own Conſcience. And which (he ſays) *Dr.* Gauden *told him he meant it of Biſhop* Juxton: ſo that here we have Dr. *Walker* not only *perfectly remembring* the ſubject matter of that Chapter, but alſo an intire Sentence, and a particular Explication relating to it. And this ſure is not very conſiſtent with his being *uncertain, whether he ever read this Book in Manuſcript, or only ſaw it with its Title of the Chapters.* I need not reflect upon this, every man knows that when an Evidence interfers with himſelf, and contradicts his own Teſtimony, it renders the whole ſuſpicious, and is a prejudice to all he delivers in that Cauſe; and all I ſhall remark is, that Dr *Walker's* Memory hath fail'd him in that very Caſe, wherein a *good Memory* is eſpecially needful. And to ſhew the Reader what weight there is to be laid upon Dr, *Walker's* Memory or Confidence, He tells us, p. 8. *I am as ſure as I can be of any thing, that Dr.* Gauden *made the extract out of this Book called* Apothegmata Carolina. And yet he is perfectly and notoriouſly miſtaken; for as Mr. *Long* ſays (*p.* 8.) not he but Dr. *Hooker was* the Collector and Publiſher, who is now or lately was living in *White Lyon Court* againſt *Virginia ſtreet* in *Wapping*. So that, how affirmative ſoever thoſe

words *I am as ſure as I can be of any thing* may be in another man's mouth, in Dr. *Walker* they only mean he imagins ſo, or he is miſtaken and forgets himſelf, and in good truth, when a man can with ſo much confidence and aſſurance atteſt a plain falſity in matter of fact, it evidently, ſhews what credit is to be given him, and that his word, though back'd with never ſo many aſſeverations, ſtands for nothing.

The next Evidence in the behalf of Biſhop *Gauden*, is taken out of ſome Papers, ſaid to be in the Hands of Mr. *Arthur North*, Merchant, living on *Tower Hill*; which Papers are ſaid to be ſent by Mrs. *Gauden* the Biſhop's Wife, to her Son Mr. *John Gauden*, after his death they came into the Hands of Mr. *Charles Gauden*, and after his death to Mr. *North*. A Summary of which is Printed in *Pag.* 35. *&* *ſeq.* of a Pamphlet intituled, *Truth brought to Light*, &c. and according to that Print, I ſhall briefly ſet down what ſeems the moſt to concern this Cauſe.

Amongſt theſe Papers, there is ſaid to be *a Letter from the Biſhop to the Lord Chancellor* Hyde, *dated* December 28. 1661. *and a Copy of a Petition to the King, written by the Biſhop's own Hand. In which he declares what Hazards*, &c. *and what he had done for comforting and incouraging the King's Friends*, &c. *And that what was done like a King, ſhould have a King-like Retribution*, &c. Another *Letter there is to the Duke of* York, *dated* Jan. 17. 1661, *urging his great Services*, &c. as alſo a *Letter from the Lord Chancellor* Hyde *to the Biſhop*, (*of the Chancellor's Hand-writting*) dated *March* 13. 1661, Importing *the Receit of ſeveral Letters from him, that he was uneaſie under the* Biſhop's *importunity. And towards the Cloſe hath this Expreſſion, The Particular you mention has indeed been imparted to me as a Secret, I am ſorry I ever knew it; and when it ceaſes to be a Secret, it will pleaſe none but Mr.* Milton. Now by all theſe Expreſſions the *Services* the Biſhop urges, the *doing like a King*, and the *Secret that will pleaſe none but Mr.* Milton, at the end of my Lord Chancellor's Letter, it is expected that we ſhould underſtand the Writing, and being the Author of this Book. But what neceſſity is there for that? Were there no Services that Dr. *Gauden* had done beſides? or at leaſt, that he might plead, whether he had done them or not? was it not poſſible for Dr. *Gauden* to have, or pretended to have done like a King, *i. e.* freely and magnificiently, (as that Scripture-Expreſſion means in the Caſe of *Araunah*) but this ſingle Inſtance?

Inſtance? And was there no other *Secret* in the World but this, that the divulging of it would gratifie Mr. *Milton*? Theſe therefore are myſtical Expreſſions, and prove nothing, and the utmoſt that can be built upon them is Preſumption and Conjecture, which are far too feeble to ſupport that which is raiſed upon them. However, if this were ſuppoſed, and that ſuch was the meaning of thoſe Expreſſions, it will ſtill be reſolved into the ſingle Teſtimony of Dr. *Gauden* himſelf and how valid that Teſtimony is in this Caſe, we ſhall ſee preſently. And in the mean time, this plainly contradicts Dr. *Walker*'s Evidence, which is, that Dr. *Gauden* told him, *He could not poſitively and certainly ſay, that King* Charles *the Second knew that he wrote the Book.* And it would look very ridiculous to preſent a Petition to that King, and to uſe it as an Inſtance to recommend him to his Favour, that in behalf of the Royal Family, *he had done like a King*, meaning, he had writ the Book, and at the ſame time not *know* whether that King knew he was the Author of it. But of this alſo more preſently. In the mean time, as to Dr. *Gauden*'s Services, and which poſſibly may be the Plea he made to the King, he did indeed write and publiſh two Books: the one *A Proteſtation againſt the King's Death*, Printed for Mr. *Royſton*, 1648: and another proving the Non-obligation of the Covenant, which might put him into the King's Favour; and in truth, it is very probable, that the *Proteſtation* was the only thing Dr. *Gauden* was concerned in; and being Printed by Mr. *Royſton*, and about the ſame time, might be the occaſion of all this Miſtake, and might be the Book he gave to the *Marqueſs of Herford*, &c. if any ſuch thing was ever done.

But to put this matter paſt all doubt and diſpute, ſince the firſt publication of this, I have met with an opportunity to ſatisfie my ſelf, and all reaſonable men, that by thoſe myſtical expreſſions, at the end of my Lord Chancellor *Hide*'s Letter, he did not intend the *King's Book* or any thing relating to it; For having heard that the Right Honourable the Preſent Earl of *Clarendon*, had ſpoken ſomething concerning a Letter, the Late Biſhop of *Wincheſter* (Dr. *Morley*) had written to my Lord Chancellor, during his Baniſhment, relating to this matter, and alſo conceiving that his Lordſhip might beſt underſtand his Father's ſence, I made bold to apply my ſelf to his Lordſhip: And his Lordſhip was pleaſed very generouſly to direct a Letter to me, bearing date from *Swallowfield October* the 22th. 1694. wherein his Lordſhip is pleaſed to expreſs himſelf

himſelf that his Lordſhip *had ſeen that Letter at Mr.* North's *and own'd it to be his Father's hand, But that there is no mention in that Letter of the King's Book, ſo that whatever the malicious Scribler draws from that Letter, is of his own wicked invention, as if a Secret my Father owns to have heard, muſt needs be the Secret of Dr.* Gauden's *being the Author of that Book which goes under the King's name.* And as to a Letter from Biſhop *Morley*, his Lordſhip ſays *that is a miſtake*, for *the Act of Parliament which baniſh'd my Father made it Penal for any to write to him except his Children and Servants, and ev'n they to ſhew all they writ to, and receiv'd from him to one of the Secretaries of State.* But the *occaſion of that miſtake* might be, for that his Lordſhip in the year 1674 (by the Command of his Father, and with the leave of the King and Queen) preparing to attend his Father that ſummer in *France*; his Lordſhip firſt went to *Farnham* to the late Biſhop of *Winton* on the 14th. of *May*, And, among ſeveral things his Lordſhip had in charge from the Biſhop to ſay to his Father, he bad him tell him that *the King had very ill People about him, who turned all things into ridicule, that they indeavour'd to bring him to have a mean opinion of the King his Father and to perſwade him, that his Father was not the Author of the Book, which goes under his name.* And when (after his Lordſhip's arrival in *France May* the 30th. 1674) His Lordſhip had deliver'd his Father, theſe particulars among others, to that concerning the Book his Father Reply'd *Good God! I thought the Marqueſs of* Hartford *had ſatisfyed the King in that matter.*

This Letter of my Lord *Clarendon* I have now by me, and I have made bold to tranſcribe theſe paſſages out of it, for the unqueſtionable ſatisfaction of the Reader in this point. For from hence it plainly appears,

1. That my Lord Chancellor did not himſelf beleive that any other Perſon was the Author of this Book beſides the King.

2. That it was matter of great admiration to his Lordſhip that any Perſon ſhould go about to perſwade the King that his Father was not the Author of it. And this being almoſt thirteen years after the Date of the former Letter from my Lord Chancellor to Dr. *Gauden*, 'tis evident to a demonſtration that whatever may be the meaning of theſe expreſſions, *the Secret that would pleaſe none but* Milton, they neither do, nor can mean the *Secret* of Dr. *Gauden*'s being the Author of that Book.

Among

Among theſe Papers there is alſo ſaid to be, *A Letter of Mrs.* Gauden's, *after the Death of her Husband, to her Son Mr.* John Gauden, *in which ſhe ſpeaks of the Book commonly called the King's Book, and calls it the Jewel, and adds, that her Husband hoped to make a Fortune by it, and wonders it ſhould be doubted whether her Husband wrote it, but ſays, ſhe has a Letter of a very great Man to clear it up.*

There is alſo (ſaid to be) *a long Narrative of Mrs.* Gauden's *Hand-writing, ſhewing, that her Husband wrote the Book, and ſent to her Son with the Letter.*

This Narrative ſets forth, that after her Husband had wrote the Book, he ſhewed it to the Lord Capel, *who approved it, and was for the Printing it, but wiſhed the King might have a ſight of it: that an opportunity was taken to convey it to his Majeſty by the Lord Marqueſs of* Hertford, *When he went to the Treaty at the* Iſle of Wight.

That the Marqueſs, after his return from thence, told her Husband, that he gave the Book to the King, and his Majeſty did well like it but was for putting it out, not as his own, but anothers; but it being urged, that Cromwell, *and others of the Army, having got a Reputation with the People for Paris and Piety, it would do beſt to be in the King's Name. His Majeſty took time to conſider of it.*

That her Husband not hearing the King's Pleaſure about it, and finding Dangers haſtening on him, he having kept a Copy by him, ſent it by one Mr. Simons *to the Preſs, together with a Letter, that Mr.* Royſton *was the Printer, but did not know but the King wrote it; that Part was ſeized in the Preſs, together with her Husband's Letter, and Mr.* Simonds *was taken. That nevertheleſs the Work was carried on and finiſhed a few days after his Majeſty's Death; that when it was Publiſhed the Parliament was inraged; and her Husband, conceiving his Life and Eſtate in danger, fled to Sir* John Wentworth's *near* Yarmouth, *intending thence to paſs the Seas, but Mr.* Simonds *falling ſick, and dying, and her Husband not being diſcovered, he altered his purpoſe, and returned home.*

That there was an Epiſtle firſt intended, that the firſt Title was Suſpiria Regalia *but changed to* Icon Baſilice; *and that there were two Chapters added.*

That the Marqueſs of Hertford, *the Lord* Capel, *Biſhop* Duppa, *and Biſhop* Morley *were at firſt the only perſons privy to it.*

That

That Bishop Duppa *of* Winchester *being very sick, her Husband went to the King, and acquainted him, that he was the Author of the Book, and for the truth thereof appealed to Bishop* Duppa *his Majesty's Tutor, who was yet living, and made an Apology for Printing it, without his Majesty's Father's Order, or his, but pleaded the Circumstance of Time, and the King's Danger; that his Majesty told her Husband, That till then he never knew that he wrote it, but thought it was his Father's yet wondered how he could have time, and observed, that it was wrote like a Scholar, as well as like a King: and said, if it had been published sooner, it might have saved his Father's life, that at the same time the King gave him a Promise of the Bishoprick of* Winchester.

That he afterwards acquainted the Duke of York *that he was the Author*, &c. This is the Sum of the Evidence that is Collected from these Papers. And from hence I have these things to observe.

1. That this is all finally resolved into the single Testimony of Dr. *Gauden* himself, and of what Consideration that ought to be in the Case before us, will appear from these particulars,

1. A Man's own Evidence in his own Cause labours under very great Prejudices; and as the Wisdom of all Laws exclude a Man from bearing witness for himself, so such Testimony can never be admitted to conclude and determine a Matter in Controversie in these two Cases.

1. When there is another Claim, and Pretender in possession of the thing in controversie, in such a Case a Man's own single Testimony signifies nothing, nor is of any Validity. The Book bears the Name of King *Charles*, and hath for many years been acknowledged to be his; and if Dr. *Gauden* should have said, That he was the Author, and not the King, it would not be sufficient to defeat the King's Title, nor to advance his own; Because a Man's own Testimony is incompetent to determine the Controversie between two Rival Authors; on the one side there is the Authority of the Book it self, which in every Line owns it self to be the King's as speaking in his Name, and the general Reputation of the World consequent upon that. On the other is only the affirmation of another Pretender, who would claim it for his own, upon his own Evidence. For let this Evidence pass through never so many Channels, it is one and the same Evidence still; if one man tells a hundred, that he did such a thing, and they all testifie, that he said so,

ſo, there are indeed a hundred Witneſſes that he ſaid it, but there is but one that he did it, and that is himſelf; if therefore Dr. *Gauden* acquainted the King, the Duke of *York*, my Lord Chancellor, Mrs. *Gauden*, Dr. *Walker* and ſeveral others, that he wrote the Book, the Evidence to the Fact is ſtill but one, and that is Dr. *Gauden* himſelf: or if Dr. *Gauden* told Mrs. *Gauden* and Dr. *Walker*, that he acquainted the Marqueſs of *Hartford*, Biſhop *Duppa*, the King, *&c.* Mrs. *Gauden* and Dr. *Walker* may be two diſtinct Witneſſes that he ſaid ſo, but there is but one that he did ſo, and that is himſelf. So that this whole Matter is reſolved into his own Evidence, which in this Caſe is no Evidence at all, nor will any wiſe Man conſider it as ſuch: eſpecially if to this be added,

2. If there be any Intereſt or Advantage to be reaped by it In this Caſe a Man's own Teſtimony is always refuſed, becauſe a Man is ſuſpected as too partial to himſelf, and apt to be ſwayed by his Intereſts. And if we are to give any credit to theſe Papers, I am afraid Mrs *Gauden* has revealed a great Secret when ſhe ſaith, That *her Husband hoped to make a Fortune by it.* For if that was the end of his owning himſelf to be the Author, it hath too great a mixture of carnal Ingredients to gain much Credit; for if Men witneſs for themſelves to advance their Ambition, and ſecular Deſigns, their Evidence is tainted, and ſavours of Project and Artifice, and Men always ſuſpect on that Hand. And I am ſorry to find that theſe very Papers inſinuate to much of this very Temper to be in Dr. *Gauden*, in theſe two Inſtances;

1. They lay before us a very ſtrange and immodeſt magnifying his own Merits, and particularly in that to King *Charles* the Second, writ by his own Hand, wherein he declares *what Hazards he had run of Life and Eſtate.* (And yet he kept one of the moſt conſiderable Livings in *England* all the time of the Uſurpation.) *And what great Advantage had accrued to the Crown by his Service.* (And in his Letter to the Duke of *York*, *he ſtrongly urges the great Services he had done*) *That what was done like a King ſhould have a King like Retribution*; *and inſtances in the Caſes of* Joſeph, Mordecai *and* Daniel, *who were honored and rewarded for the Services they did to the reſpective Princes, and in particular obſerves, that* Ahaſuerus *was uneaſie, till* Mordecai *had had his merited Reward.* Now theſe are fine Characters indeed, and give a good account of Dr. *Gauden*'s Performances, but they look a little ſcurvily coming from his own Mouth; had the Dr. never a

Friend at Court? methinks my Lord of *Warwick* or *Manchester*, his known Friends and Patrons, or elſe my Lord Marqueſs of *Hartford* and Biſhop *Duppa* might have ſav'd him this Trouble, and ſo certainly they would, had they known by him ſuch a thing as the writing the King's Book: but ſince the Dr. was forced to make uſe of himſelf, it ſeems pretty plain, that there was no Body elſe to imploy in this Matter, and that no Perſon about the King knew the Drs. Merits ſo well as himſelf. The Truth is, a Man that is clamorous in his own Praiſe, always looks ſuſpiciouſly; and he that can break through all the Bounds of Modeſty and Decency to magnifie his own Merits, may poſſibly not be very ſhy in ſtraining at a point of Truth to make it good; Boaſting always ſtands near *Untruth*, and treads on the very Heels of it. To this may be added,

2. An immoderate Deſire of *Reward*, and undue Solicitation for it: thus theſe Papers repreſent him, as diſcontented with his preferment to the Biſhoprick of *Exeter*, telling the King, that he had *a high Rack, but a low Manger*, altho there be ſeveral Biſhopricks in *England* and *Wales* inferior to that in point of Revenue, and at that time poſſeſſed by Men of very great Worth and Virtue. Thus alſo he teaches the King to be grateful to him, by the reſpective Advancements of *Joſeph*, *Daniel*, and *Mordecai*. Thus in the Letter to the Duke of *York* he *importunately begs his* Royal Highneſs *to intercede for him with the King*. And in the Lord Chancellor *Hyde's* Letter to him it is expreſſed, that he was *uneaſie under the Biſhop's Importunity*. Theſe things plainly repreſent a very ambitious Temper, covetuous of Preferment, haſty and impatient in the purſuit of it; and when Men are under the power of ſuch a Complexion, they do not generally manage themſelves by nice and punctual Methods, and to be ſure ſuch a Man's Merits will loſe nothing by his own telling them, nor himſelf any thing for want of asking. And the truth is, over-valuing our own Merits and claiming thoſe which are none of our own, differ very little in point of Modeſty and Virtue; and he that can do one, in all probability, will not ſtick at the other, if he thinks it feaſible to accompliſh the ends he aims at. So that thoſe who have publiſhed theſe Papers have done but little Service to the Biſhop's Memory, and as little to the Cauſe they pretend to maintain; for tho I do not from hence conclude, that the Biſhop ever told King *Charles*, the Duke of *York*, or the Lord Chancellor that he was the Author of this Book; yet if ever he did ſo, or to any others, I do conclude, that it being his own Cauſe, and for ſuch Ends, and joyned with ſuch a Temper,

per, it apparently ſinks the Credit of his own Teſtimony, and renders it of no value.

2. Another thing which would take off the Force of Dr. *Gauden*'s Teſtimony in this Caſe, ſuppoſing he ever atteſted it, is the Immorality and Infamy of the whole Practice, which muſt be charged upon him upon ſuch a ſuppoſition. And that is writing a Book in the King's Name, and therein perſonating him in the Acts of Piety, Devotion, and high points of Conſcience, which, whatever the end might be, in the ſofteſt Language, is firſt inventing a Falſhood, and then impoſing it upon the World, and (as theſe Papers intimate) upon the King too, (for they plainly tell us he never had the King's Conſent.) Had the Devotionary Part been Compoſed for the King's private Uſe and Aſſiſtance, the Attempt might have been dutiful and charitable, tho there had been no need for it, to a Prince who was ſo admirably qualified himſelf, and the King, if he had thought them ſuitable, might by them have expreſſed the Sence of his own Heart. But to give them to the World as the King's own, which he never framed nor uſed, nor ſo much as owned, is to counterfeit the King's Conſcience, which, as I take it, is a more audacious and far greater Crime, than to counterfeit his Coin, his Hand, or his great Seal; for ſuch a Practice mocks God as well as Men, and daubs and juggles in thoſe very Caſes, in which are required the greateſt plainneſs and ſincerity. And in all reſpects, to counterfeit Prayers, Repentance, Charity and other Graces, (abundantly expreſſed in that excellent Book) and to impoſe them upon the World for true and genuine, is ſuch a Piece of Forgery and Impoſture Fraud and Hypocriſie together, that no end can warrant, and nothing can parallel. And now if a man had Acted in ſuch a manner, methinks he ſhould have but little ſtomach to own it, or if he did, in the ſame breath he convicts himſelf of Falſhood, and lays a Bar to his own Teſtimony; for 'tis obvious, that if a Man in ſuch Circumſtances can father his own Book upon the King, he may with the ſame truth and juſtice lay claim to the King's Book: and the pretence of *Good Ends* does not alter the Caſe, for no doubt a good Biſhoprick may be thought a *Good End* too; and he that thinks the *King's Honor* will juſtifie the acting *deceitfully* for him, may as well think his *own Honor* may juſtifie the ſame meaſure for acting for himſelf. And what, I wonder, is ſuch a Teſtimony worth in this Caſe, when the Teſtimony it ſelf plainly declares, that he firſt abuſed the World, in giving

them a Book for the King's, which was not his, and afterwards abuſed the King in taking great pains to aſſume it to himſelf. And the truth is, this Evidence (ſuch as it is) confronts it ſelf; for if Dr. *Gauden* was the Publiſher of this Book (as theſe Papers repreſent) then he gave as publick an Evidence as was poſſible, that the King was the Author of it, and as much as any man does who ſets his name to his own Works. And if he told Mrs. *Gauden*, Dr. *Walker*, or any other, that he himſelf was the Author, then he told them one thing, and the whole Kingdom another, which, at laſt, makes a fine Evidence of it, and very fit to determine the Controverſie, which in the very Caſe contradicts it ſelf; and it is impoſſible to reconcile Dr. *Gauden* the Publiſher, to Dr. *Gauden* the private Relater. I muſt confeſs, I am heartily ſorry, and afflicted, that I have ſaid thus much concerning Biſhop *Gauden*, conſidering both his Character and Station in the Church, and that he hath been long ſince dead. But thoſe who have been ſo erneſt to aſſert his Right to this Book, are to be thanked for it; for it is the very Character they have given him, and the very means they have uſed to prove his Title. And if the Memory of King *Charles* the Firſt muſt ſtand in competition with the Memory of Dr. *Gauden*, I think there needs no Apology for doing Right to that King's Memory, tho it ſhould reflect on Biſhop *Gauden*, or a greater Subject then he. But this I have ſaid only on ſuppoſition, that Dr. *Gauden* did in truth own himſelf to be the Author. But that which follows, I hope, will clear him from that Imputation, how ſevere ſoever thoſe who plead his Cauſe, have been to his Memory. And that is

2. The ſecond thing I have to obſerve from theſe Papers of Mrs. *Gauden*, which is, that they do, in direct Terms, and in notorious Inſtances contradict the Teſtimony of Dr. *Walker*. And to make this very plain, I ſhall ſet them oppoſite to one another in two Columns.

Doctor *Walker*, pag. 5.	*Mrs.* Gauden, *pag.* 37.
Dr. Gauden *ſome time after the King was murdered, upon my asking him whether He (the King) had ever ſeen the Book, gave me this Anſwer: I know it certainly no more than you, but I uſed my*	'An Opportunity was taken 'to convey (the Book) to 'his Majeſty, by the Lord 'Marqueſs of *Hartford*, when 'he went to the Treaty at the 'Iſle of Wight: that the Mar- 'queſs, after his return, told

beſt

best Endeavours that he might; for I delivered a Copy of it to the Marqueſs of Hartford, *when he went to the Treaty at the Iſle of* Wight, *and intreated his Lordſhip, if he could obtain any private opportunity, he would deliver it to his Majeſty, and humbly deſire to know his Majeſty's Pleaſure concerning it. But the Violence which threatened the King, haſtening ſo faſt, he ventured to Print it, and never knew what was the Iſſue of ſending it; for when the thing was done, he judged it not prudent to make further noiſe about it by inquiry.*

Dr. *Walker*, pag. 5.

I asking him (for we ſeldom were in private but ſomewhat was diſcourſed of this Book, even to the laſt time I ſaw him after he was Lord Biſhop of Worceſter *elect) whether that King* Charles *the Second knew that he wrote it, he gave me this Anſwer: I cannot poſitively and certainly ſay he doth, becauſe he was never pleaſed to take expreſs notice of it to me; but I take it for granted he doth, for I am ſure, the Duke of* York *doth, for he hath ſpoken of it to me, and own'd it as a ſeaſonable and acceptable ſervice, and he knowing it, I queſtion not but the King alſo doth.*

Mrs. Gauden, *pag.* 38.

'Biſhop *Duppa* of *Winche-*
'*ſter* being very ſick, her Hus-
'band went to the King, and
'acquainted him, that he was
'the Author of the Book; and
'for the truth thereof appeal-
'ed to Biſhop *Duppa*, his Maje-
'ſty's Tutor, who was yet li-
'ving, and made an Apology
'for printing it without his
'Majeſty's Father's order, or
'his, but pleaded the circum-
'ſtances of time, and the
'King's danger. That his Ma-
'jeſty told her Husband, that
'till then he never knew that
'he wrote it, but thought it
'was his Fathers, and wondred
'how he could have time;
'and obſerved it was wrote
'like a Scholar as well as like
'a King; and ſaid, that if it had been publiſhed ſooner, it
'might have ſav'd his Father's Life. That at the ſame time
'the King gave him a Promiſe of the Biſhoprick of *Win-*
'cheſter.

'That

'That he afterwards acquainted the Duke of *York*, &c. That 'her Husband then told his Highneſs, that the King promiſed 'him the Biſhoprick of *Wincheſter*, and that his Highneſs aſſured 'him of his favour.

And now, what an admirable Harmony and Agreement have we here? Such Evidence muſt needs be credited, they are ſo conſiſtent with one another in their Stories. In Dr. *Walker*'s Evidence Dr. *Gauden did not certainly know, and no more than Dr.* Walker *himſelf, whether King* Charles I. *had ever ſeen the Book.* But in Mrs. *Gauden*'s Evidence, *the Marqueſs of* Hartford *told him, that he gave the Book to the King.* In *Dr.* Walker's, *he never knew what was the Iſſue of ſending it.* But in *Mrs.* Gauden's, *that the King liked it well, but was for putting it out, not as his own,* &c. In *Dr.* Walkers, *when the thing was done, he judg'd it not prudent to make further noiſe about it by enquiry.* Nor need he, as Mrs. *Gauden* repreſents it, when theMarqueſs had told him already, and by ſuch a remarkable circumſtance, That *Cromwell,* &c. *having got a great reputation with the People for Parts and Piety, it would do beſt to be in the King's Name; and his Majeſty took time to conſider of it.*

In Dr. *Walkers* Evidence, *Dr.* Gauden *could not poſitively and certainly ſay that King* Charles II. *knew that he wrote it,* But in Mrs. *Gauden*'s he told that King himſelf, *that he was the Author* of it, and appeal'd to Biſhop *Duppa* for the truth of it. In Dr. *Walker*'s he gave this as a Reaſon why he could not poſitively ſay it, *viz. becauſe the King was never pleaſed to take expreſs notice of it to him.* But in Mrs. *Gauden*'s the King took expreſs notice of it to him; *and told him that till then he never knew that he wrote it, but thought it had been his Father's yet wondered how he could have time,* &c. That, *had it been publiſhed ſooner it might have ſaved his Father's Life.* And all this by a very good token; That, *at the ſame time the King promiſed him the Biſhoprick of* Wincheſter. In Dr. *Walher's* he collects the King's knowing it by inference, and *takes it for granted, becauſe he is ſure the Duke of* York *doth, and he knowing it, he does not queſtion but the King alſo doth.* But in Mrs. *Gauden*'s; *he acquainted the King himſelf*; and not only ſo but he acquainted the King firſt, and the Duke of *York* afterwards; as Mrs. *Gauden* axpreſly, That *he afterwards acquainted the Duke, that he was the Author.* And by the ſame token, That *he then told his Highneſs, that the King promiſed him the Biſhoprick of* Wincheſter. So that if it had

not

not been ſaid ſo expreſly, this telling the Duke muſt be ſubſequent to that Promiſe, which (as Mrs. *Gauden* ſays) was at the ſame time that he told the King. And laſtly, In Dr. *Walker*'s. the Reaſon of Dr. *Gauden*'s. Aſſurance that the Duke knew it, was, for that *the Duke had ſpoken of it to him*; but in Mrs. *Gaudens* That *he had acquainted the Duke himſelf.*

And now, how like ye this my Maſters? Is not this rare Evidence, to convince the World, that agrees at this rate? Do men uſe to believe a matter of fact upon the Credit of Witneſſes who contradict each other? Methinks the example of *Daniel* may ſerve to ſhew us the value of ſuch Teſtimony, as well as to teach the King Gratitude: The two Elders were both poſitive as to the fact, but their differing in circumſtance detected their Falſity. And the two Elders did not differ from one another, by many degrees, ſo much as Dr. *Walker* and Mrs. *Gauden.* In ſhort, either Dr. *Gauden* told theſe things reſpectively to Dr. *Walker* and Mrs. *Gauden*, or he did not; if he did not, their Evidence is of no value; if he did, his own is of no value as contradicting himſelf.

And ſo I have done with this part of the Diſcourſe, the Evidence that is produced to intitle Dr. *Gauden* to this Book. And I appeal to all the World, whether ſuch Teſtimony ſo circumſtantiated be fit, or ever was admitted, to determine the leaſt Controverſie in the World? And if there was no more to be ſaid for the Kings being the true Author, but only the bare Name and general Acceptation, that is abundantly ſufficient to vindicate it to him from all that is here offered; and no rational and unprejudiced man can alter his Sentiments, and tranſlate it to Dr. *Gauden* upon ſuch Evidence; and much leſs if this be confronted by plain, direct and unexceptionable Evidence in behalf of the King. And this is the third thing.

But before I proceed to that it may be reaſonable to acquaint the Reader, with a new Evidence that is lately come to my hands, in relation to this matter, and which plainly and fully informs us, what Title Dr. *Gauden* had to this Book, and what ſhare he might pretend to in it, and that is the Quality of a *Tranſcriber* or *Copyer* but by no means the Author, or having had any the leaſt hand in the compoſure. This appears from a Letter (which I have now in my hands) of Mr. *Le Pla* Miniſter of *Finchingfeild* to Dr. *Goodall.* This Letter bears date *Nov.* 27. 1696. and the paſſages in it that concerne this matter are as follow.

William Allen *was born in this neighborhood, where ſundry of his Relations have lived in good credit. He had two Uncles*

Trades-

Tradesmen in London, *one of them a Draper, to whom he was an Apprentice, but upon the breaking out of the Civill Wars he ſhut up Shop, and his Kinsman* William *ſome time after was Servant to Dr.* Gauden *for ſeveral years, and at laſt marryed one of his Family, who is ſtill alive, and tells me Dr.* Walker *lived there part of the time with them, and went thence to my Lord of* Warwick's. *Her late Husband* Allen *collected tythes for me the two firſt years after my coming hither, by which means I afterwards received ſeveral viſits from him, wherein he would talke much of his Maſter* Gauden *and the many meſſages he had been ſent upon in the night, between the Doctor and his family in thoſe times of difficulty, the dangers he had incurr'd on his account, having more then once ſaved him from being robbed, and been wounded in his defence, once particularly by a Piſtol ſhot in the face, whereof he carryed the Scar to his grave. About ten years ago he had ſome ſmall Eſtate befaln him in* Wethersfeild *a Town about a mile and half from this place, upon which he lived the reſt of his days, and died there in* May *laſt, in good and honeſt repute, for any thing I ever could hear to the contrary. I beg your pardon for troubling you with this long ſtory, which might ſeem impertinent, if it did not ſhew the great confidence the Doctor repoſed in him, and the reaſon he had to do ſo. But that which is more to the purpoſe, and which I am ready to make oath of if deſired, is that this* William Allen *coming one day to ſee me, and after dinner being alone with me. I fell into diſcourſe with him about* Dr. Gauden *and the King's Book, He ſaid moſt people thought his Maſter to be the Author of it, or to have had the cheif hand in it, or to that purpoſe, I told him I could never beleive it, for ſome reaſons I then gave him, whereupon he ſmiled and told me, he beleived he could ſay more to that buſineſs than any man beſides him, for that* Dr. Gauden *told him he had borrowed the Book, and was obliged to return it by ſuch a time, that (beſides what other time he might imploy in it) he ſate up one whole night to tranſcribe it, that he (*William Allen*) ſate up in the chamber with him, to wait upon him, to make his fires and ſnuff his candles. This I am ready to depoſe, if required. I think he ſaid the Book was borrowed of Mr.* Symmons *of* Rayne *one of the King's Chaplains, but it being ſome time ago, I cannot be ſo poſitive in that, and ſeveral other Circumſtances, as I ſhould have been, had I ſuſpected his death ſo nigh, which happened before I heard of his ſickneſs, but he being a vigorous healthy man, always able to ſpeake himſelf, I did not then think it neceſſary, to take notes of what he ſaid, to whom recourſe might be had at any time. That which makes it very probable that Dr.* Gauden

Gauden *had the Book from Mr.* Symmons, *is the near neighborhood, and great familiarity which (I am told) was between them. One thing I had forgot* viz. *that to my knowledge* Allen *could read and write very well, and ſo could not eaſily be deceived, either in the book, or in his Maſters hand, tho the Doctor had not told him that it was none of his.* Thus far Mr. *Le Pla*, which is ſo very plain and cleer, and full to the point before us, that I ſhall not need to ſay any thing to enforce it, but ſhall intirely leave it to the Readers judgment, and ſo go on to the next. *viz.*

3. I ſhall produce the Evidence that hath appeared to prove the King the Author of this Book, and altho there are ſome others, and which are of good Credit and may deſerve Conſideration, yet I ſhall confine my ſelf to theſe, which are plain and direct, and come home to the very Caſe; a Teſtimony that plainly gives Evidence to the King's Title, and that Evidence unexceptionably convey'd to us: Some of theſe, and theſe the moſt conſiderable, are ſumm'd up by Sir. *William Dugdale* (*in his ſhort view of the late troubles in* England, p. 380.) in theſe Words: 'I ſhall make it evident from the Teſtimony of 'very credible Perſons yet living, that he had begun the pen-'ning of them long before he went from *Oxford* to the *Scots*. 'For the Manuſcript it ſelf, written with his own hand, being 'found in his Cabinet, which was taken at *Naveſby* Fight, was 'reſtored to him after he was brought to *Hampton Court* by the 'hand of Major *Huntington*, thro the favour of General *Fairfax* 'of whom he obtain'd it, and that whilſt he was in the *Iſle* of '*Wight*, it was there ſeen frequently by Mr. *Thomas Herbert*, who 'then waited on his Majeſty in his Bedchamber; as alſo by 'Mr. *William Levet*, (a Page of the *Back Stairs*) the Title 'then prefixed to it being *Suſpiria Regalia*, who not only read 'ſeveral Parts thereof, but ſaw the King divers times writing 'farther on it, Add hereunto the Teſtimony of Mr. *Richard* '*Royſton* a Bookſeller at the *Angel* in *Ivy Lane*; who having 'in thoſe rebellious times adventured to Print divers of his 'Majeſty's Declarations, Speeches and Meſſages; about the be-'ginning of *October* 1648. (the King being then in the *Iſle* of '*Wight*) was ſent to by his Majeſty to prepare all things ready 'for the Printing ſome Papers, which he purpoſed ſhortly af-'ter to convey unto him, which was this very Copy brought 'to him on the 23*d.* of *December* next following, by one Mr. '*Edward Simonds* a reverend Divine (who received it from 'Dr. *Bryan Duppa* then Biſhop of *Salisbury*, and afterwards of '*Wincheſter*. In the Printing whereof Mr. *Royſton* made ſuch

'ſpeed, that it was finiſh'd before that diſmal 30*th*, of *January*, 'that his Majeſty's Life was taken away.

In this Summary are four conſiderable Evidences, Major *Huntington*, Mr. *Herbert*, Mr. *Levet*, and Mr. *Royſton*; three of them directly to the thing, and Mr. *Royſton*'s ſo circumſtantiated, as amounts very near to a direct Evidence.

1. Major *Huntington*. To this Dr. *Walker* excepts, (p. 33.) that at *Tunbridge* the Major told him, that *all he knew or ever ſaid concerning it was, when that Book was publiſhed, and ſo confidently reported to be the Kings, then ſurely, or I believe theſe are the Papers I ſee him ſo uſually take out of his Cabinet. But this was but my Conjecture and I never declared it to be otherwiſe; for I aſſure you I never read one Line or Word of the Papers in the King's hand; I was not ſo rude, and I cannot ſay there was one Paſſage in thoſe Papers which is in this printed Book: For how ſhould I, never having looked into them?* Now this Evidence of Dr. *Walkers* is confronted by another of Mr. *Rich. Duke*'s in a Letter to Dr. *Charles Goodal June* 15. 92. in theſe Words: *Sir, I confeſs that I heard Major* Huntington *to ſay more than once, that whilſt he guarded* Charles I. *at* Holmby-Houſe (*as I remember*) *he ſaw ſeveral Chapters or Leaves of that great King's Meditations, lying on the Table, ſeveral Mornings; with a Pen and Ink, with which the King ſcratched out or blotted ſome Lines or Words of ſome of them: Upon which I muſt alſo confeſs, that I concluded they were originally from the King; but others have drawn a contrary Argument from the King's correcting the Papers, yet I put this under my hand, that the Major told me that he did ſuppoſe them originally from that learned Prince. Which is the* totum *that can be intimated, from, Sir,*

Your humble Servant, Richard Duke.

In this Teſtimony of Mr. *Duke* theſe things are to be cleared.

1. That there is a difference between this account, and that of Sir *William Dugdale*'s. But notwithſtanding both their Evidence are very conſiſtent, and by no means contradictory. Sir *William Dugdale* ſays that Major *Huntington*, through the favour of *Fairfax*, *reſtored to him the Manuſcript after* Navesby *Fight*; Mr. *Duke* only ſays that the Major *ſaw them lying on the Table* &c. which the Major might very well do, and yet before that reſtore them to the King from General *Fairfax*; which as Mr. *Duke* ſays nothing of, ſo neither doth what he ſays any way contradict; ſo that Mr. *Duke*'s Evidence is not contrary to Sir *William*'s, but a Supplement to it, and a further account of the Major's Knowledge of this matter:

matter: He teſtifies indeed more then Sir *William*, but by no means interfers with him. So likewiſe when Sir *William* ſays it was at *Hampton Court*, this is eaſily reconcil'd, becauſe Mr. *Duke* ſpeaks diffidently, that it was at *Holmby-Houſe as he remembers*, but is not poſitive but it might be ſome other place, as theſe Expreſſions plainly denote.

2. The next thing is, that Mr. *Duke* does not ſay in expreſs terms, that thoſe Meditations, which the Major ſaw *lying upon the Table ſeveral Mornings, and the King correct them*; that thoſe were the ſame that were printed in the King's name. But it is plainly imply'd, for Mr. *Duke* ſays, that from the Major's account to him he conceiv'd they were *originally* from the King, and is poſitive that the Major told him, that he ſuppoſed them *originally* from the King; that is plainly the *Meditations* in Controverſie, for the Word *originally* here can refer to nothing elſe, but to another Pretender. And the ſaying that *others have drawn a contrary Argument from the Kings correcting the Papers*, yet further proves it. So that as Mr. *Duke* did not, ſo it is plain the Major himſelf did not mean any other Papers than the *original* Manuſcript of the King's Book or of ſome part of it, which he ſaw lie on the Table, and the King correcting it. The Sum therefore is, that the Teſtimony of Major *Huntington* as it is repreſented by Mr. *Duke*, is contradictory to the ſame repreſented by Dr. *Walker*, and the Validity of the reſpective Teſtimony muſt depend on the Credit of the reſpective Witneſſes. And how much Dr. *Walker*'s Teſtimony is to be rely'd on in this Caſe I have ſhewn already; and Mr. *Duke*'s Teſtimony is confirm'd by another; Mr. *Cave Beck* in a Letter to Dr. *Hollingworth* atteſting; 'That Major *Hun-*
'*tington* at *Ipſwich* aſſured him, that ſo much
'of the ſaid Book as contained his Majeſty's
'Meditations before *Naveſby* Fight, was ta-
'ken in the King's Cabinet; and that Sir
'*Thomas Fairfax* deliver'd the ſaid Papers unto him, and
'ordered him, to carry them to the King: and alſo told him
'that when he deliver'd them to the King, his Maieſty ap-
'peared very joyful, and ſaid he eſteemed them more than
'all the Jewels he had loſt in the Cabinet.

Dr. Holl. *Charact. of King* Charles I. p. 27.

And to ſhew how bold a man Dr. *Walker* is, and how unfit to be truſted, when he reports Evidences from the mouths of other men, I have now in my hands that very Relation which Major *Huntington* made to Sir *William Dugdale* in *June* 1679. And what concerns the preſent Caſe is in theſe words.

And as to the Eikon Baſilike *he ſayth, that after the King was brought to* Hampton-Court, *his Majeſty there acquainting him with the loſs of that Book at* Navesby *Fight, and deſiring him to uſe his intereſt to regain it, he did himſelf apply to General* Fairfax, *and by his means obtained it, it being bound up in a white vellam cover, and (as he well remembers) all the Chapters in it were written by the hand of Sir* Edward Walker, *but much corrected with interlineations with the Kings own hand, the Prayers being all written with the Kings own hand, which, he ſays, be knew ſo to be.*

And now does not any man ſee what agreement there is between this and the *Tunbridge-Relation?* why Dr. *Walkers* Major *Huntington* is quite another thing, He never heard the King complain of the loſs of the Book, never apply'd to the General to regain it, never ſaw any one paſſage in it, He was ſo modeſt as only to conjecture, or beleive, but knew nothing at all of the matter, nor never ſaid, or declared otherwiſe: And it was abſolutely neceſſary for Dr. *Walker* that it ſhould be ſo; for otherwiſe this fancy of Dr. *Gauden*'s writing the Book, muſt have ſunk to the Ground. But Dr. *Walker* is dead, and I ſpare his Memory and ſhould be content to have his faults buryed with him.

2. The next Evidence is that of Mr. *Herbert*, afterwards Sir *Thomas Herbert*; who not only ſaw it, as Sir *William Dugdale* ſays, but moreover had the *original Manuſcript* given him by the King. and which was wrote by the King's own hand. This hath never yet appeared publickly to the World, and therefore I ſhall ſet it down at large, as it was tranſmitted to me by the Reverend Mr. *Cudworth* Rector of *Barmbrough* in *Yorkſhire*, and atteſted by ſeveral worthy and learned Perſons, in theſe Words:

In a Manuſcript Book in *Folio* of Sir *Thomas Herbert*'s well bound, fairly written, and conſiſting of 83 Pages, and by him called *Carolina Threnodia*, having the Picture of King *Charles* I. in the Front, and beginning thus:

SIR,

'By yours of the 22*d*. of *Auguſt* laſt I find you have received 'my former Letters of the 1*ſt*. and 13*th*. of *May*, 1678. And 'ſeeing it is your farther deſire I ſhould recollect what I can 'well remember upon that ſad Subject more at large, I am wil-'ling to ſatisfie you therein ſo far forth as my Memory will aſ-'ſiſt. Some ſhort Notes of Occurrences I then took, which in this 'long Interval of time and ſeveral Removes of my Family are

'either

'either loſt, or ſo miſlaid at preſent I cannot find, which ren-
'ders this Narrative not ſo methodical nor ſo large as other-
'wiſe I ſhould, and probably by you may be expected. Nor
'would I trouble you much with what any other has writ, but
'in a ſummary way give you ſome Court Paſſages, which I ob-
'ſerved during the two laſt years of his Majeſty's Life and
'Reign; being the time of his Solitudes and Sufferings.— In
'*pag.* 21. Nevertheleſs, both times he carefully obſerved his
'uſual times ſet apart for private Devotion, and for writing.
'Mr. *Harrington* and Mr. *Herbert* continued waiting on his Ma-
'jeſty as Grooms in the Bedchamber, he alſo gave Mr. *Herbert*
'the Charge of his Books, of which the King had a Catalogue,
'and from time to time had brought unto him ſuch as from
'time to time he was pleaſed to call for: The ſacred Scripture
'was the Book he moſt delighted in, read often in Biſhop *Andrew's*
'Sermons, *Hooker*'s Eccleſiaſtical Policy, Dr. *Hammond*'s Works,
'*Villalpandus* upon *Ezekiel*, &c. *Sandy*'s Paraphraſe upon King
'*David*'s Pſalms, *Herbert*'s divine Poems; and alſo recreated
'himſelf in reading *Godfrey* of *Bulloigne* writ in *Italian* by
'*Torquato Taſſo*, and done into *Engliſh* Heroick Verſe by Mr.
'*Fairfax*. A Poem his Majeſty much commended, as he did
'*Arioſto*, by Sir *John Harrington* a facetious Poet, much eſteem'd
'of by Prince *Henry* his Maſter, *Spencer*'s Fairy Queen and the
'like, for alleviating his Spirits after ſerious Studies. And at
'this time it was, (as is preſumed) he compoſed his Book cal-
'led *Suſpiria Regalia* publiſh'd ſoon after his Death, and intitled
'*The King*'s *Portraicture in his Solitudes and Sufferings*. Which
'Manuſcript Mr. *Herbert* found among thoſe Books his Majeſty
'was graciouſly pleaſed to give him, (thoſe excepted which
'he bequeathed to his Children hereafter mentioned) in regard
'Mr. *Herbert*, tho he did not ſee the King write that Book,
'his Majeſty being always private when he writ, and theſe his
'Servants never coming into the Bedchamber when the King
'was private until he call'd; yet comparing it with his Hand-
'writing in other things, he found it ſo very like, as induces his
'belief that it was his own; having ſeen much of the King's
'Writings before. And to inſtance particulars, in that his Maje-
'ſty's Tranſlation of Dr. *Sanderſon* the late Biſhop of *Lincoln*'s
'Book *de juramentis* or a like Title, concerning Oaths, all of it
'tranſlated into Engliſh, and writ with his own hand, and
'which in his Bedchamber he was pleaſed to ſhew his Servants,
'Mr. *Harrington* and Mr. *Herbert*, and commanding them to
'examine it with the Original, they found it accurately tranſla-
'ted.

This

This is a true Copy taken out of the original Manuſcript, and compared by Us,

Thomas Vincent Eſq.
Thomas Fountaine Eſq.
Ra. Eaton, Rector of *Darfield.*
J. Cudworth, Rector of *Barmbrough.*
Tho. Maulyverer, Rector of *Spersbrough.*
Tho. Burton, Clerk.
Jo. Newſome, Rector of *Warmſworth.*

This Manuſcript is now in the Hands of the Lady *Herbert* the Relict of Sir *Tho. Herbert* but now marryed to *Henry Edmonds* Eſq; living in the Town of *Worsbrough* in *Yorkſhire.*

And I can now give a farther account of this Manuſcript of Sir *Tho. Herbert*, It was written at the deſire of Sir *William Dugdale*, and ſent to him in form of a Letter, a tranſcript of which I have now by me, and have carefully compar'd the foregoing Citations, and will my ſelf be reſponſible for the truth of them.

3. The next Evidence is Mr. *Levet*, who beſides Sir *William Dugdale*'s Teſtimony hath himſelf lately given an account of his Knowledge of this matter, in a Letter to *Seymour Bourman* Eſq; in *Lincolns-Inn Fields.* In theſe words:

Dear Brother,

'Yours of the 21. of this inſtant *April* I received, and one 'Letter before that to the ſame effect, *viz.* To give a true ac- 'count of my Knowledge of that unparallel'd Book, which his 'ſacred Majeſty of bleſſed Memory King *Charles* I. (murder'd 'by his own rebellious Subjects before his own Palace at '*Whitehall*, with all the violent and malicious Circumſtances 'that wicked men could invent) which Book of my certain 'Knowledge I can depoſe was truly his own, having obſerved 'his Majeſty oftentimes writing his Royal Reſentments of the 'bold and inſolent Behaviour of his Soldiers, (his rebellious 'Subjects) when they had him in their Cuſtody. I waited on 'his Majeſty as Page of the Bedchamber in ordinary, during 'all the time of his Solitudes (except when I was forced from 'him) and eſpecially being nominated by his Majeſty to be 'one of his Servants, among others that ſhould attend him, du- 'ring the Treaty at *Newport* in the *Iſle* of *Wight*, had the Happineſs to read the ſame oftentimes in Manuſcript, under his 'Majeſty's own hand, being pleaſed to leave it in the Window 'in his own Bedchamber, where I was always oblig'd to attend

'his

'his Majesty's coming thither. But the Treaty being ended in 'few days after, the Soldiers with one to conduct them, by 'name Mr. *Anthony Mildmay*, then Cup-bearer, came to the 'Bedchamber about Two of the Clock in the night, and knock'd 'at the door, and one Mr. *Herbert*, Mr. *Kirk*, and my self, ha-'ving some hint of their Intentions, were watching in an inner 'room, & hearing some noise went into his Majesty's Bedcham-'ber, and asked who they were that durst disturb his Majesty 'at that unseasonable time of the night; who answered, they 'were sent to tell the King he must rise, and go with them. 'We acquainting his Majesty with their design, he was pleased 'to command us to tell them, he would go with them, but it 'was not his usual hour to rise so soon; we again acquainted 'the Soldiers with his Majesty's Answer: They instead of com-'plying with his Majesty bid us tell him, if he did not rise pre-'sently, they must force him to it: His Majesty only said, if 'I must give me my Clothes, and so he immediately arose. '(Here ye may observe a mirrour of Patience in a distressed 'Prince;) during the time of his Majesty's making himself rea-'dy, he concern'd himself only how to secure this Book of his, 'and a small Cabinet, wherein he secured his Letters to his 'Queen, who was then beyond the Sea; and his Majesty having 'procured a Pass for me from the Governour, that I should 'wait on him there, he gave me in charge this said Book and 'small Cabinet, which I faithfully presented to his Majesty's 'own hands that night in *Hurst Castle*. But the Governour, by 'what Information is too tedious to insert here, at this time, 'and therefore I omit it, did on *Saturday* banish me out of the 'Castle.

'I should have sent you a Relation which I had of *Royston* 'the King's Printer, for the Printing the said Book, by his Ma-'jesty's special Command, brought to him by a Divine, but not 'to be*Printed till after the King's Death, which 'he observed accordingly; for which *Cromwel* 'sent for him to *Whitehall*, not only promising 'Rewards, but also threatning Punishments, 'if he would not deny, that he Printed it by his Majesty's Or-'der, which he refusing to do, did imprison him for about 'a Fortnight, but seeing he could not work upon him, released 'him, which is all at present from

* *By* Printed *is to be understood* Published.

From Savernack Parke,
near Marleborough,
Apr. 29. 1691.

Your Affectionate Brother
to serve you,
William Levet.

To

To this Dr. *Walker* anſwers, (Pag. 34.) *There is no ſuch Chapter or Title in all* Εικων Βασιλικη, meaning, as the *Royal Reſentment of the bold and inſolent Behaviour of his Soldiers (his rebellious Subjects.)* Very right, Sir, but there is the thing; and Mr. *Levet* did not ſay that was the Title to any Chapter in that Book, or a Title to what he ſaw the King write, but the Subject Matter of it; and that it is of more Chapters than one. In the mean time it is very pleaſant, when a Man teſtifies, that he will depoſe, the Book was the King's own, for that he had obſerved the King writing his Royal Reſentments, *&c.* to anſwer there *is no ſuch Chapter or Title.* But I pray, Sir, are there in that Book no *Royal Reſentments of the inſolent Behaviour of the Rebellious Soldiers?* If there be none indeed, then Mr. *Levet* could not conclude they were part of the Book, tho he ſaw the King writ them; but if there be, 'tis extreamely ridiculous to ſay, there is *no ſuch Chapter*, or no ſuch *Title*; the Force of this Teſtimony therefore, is not about the *Title*, but the thing, and that Mr. *Levet could depoſe that the Book was the King's, and that he read the ſame in Manuſcript under the King's own Hand.* And what does Dr. *Walker* ſay to this? why truly he ſays, *I muſt beg his pardon to believe he is miſtaken.* And ſo it ſeems Mr. *Levet's depoſing, and ſeeing the King write ſome of it, and reading it under the King's own Hand* is all confuted, and it neither is, nor can be ſo, becauſe Dr. *Walker begs his pardon.* This is an excellent way of defeating the Force of an Evidence, and taking off the Edge of the Teſtimony of an Eye-witneſs; and if this will do, Dr. *Walker* muſt needs gain the Cauſe; for there is no doubt but he will *beg the pardon* of all the King's Witneſſes, if he can ſo eaſily quit his Hands of them. In the mean time, that Mr. *Levet* was not *miſtaken*, but delivered his Knowledg of this Matter, we have confirmed by another Teſtimony of his, and of another Date, in the poſſeſſion of his Son, Fellow of *Exeter* College in *Oxon.* in theſe Words: *If any one has a deſire to know the true Author of a Book intitled* Εικων Βασιλικη, *I, one of the Servants of King* Charles *the Firſt in his Bed-chamber, do declare, when his ſaid Majeſty was Priſoner in the* Iſle of Wight, *that I read over the above-mentioned Book (which was long before the ſaid* Book *was Printed) in his* Bed-chamber, *writ with his Majeſty's own Hand, with ſeveral Interlinings. Moreover his Majeſty King* Charles I. *told me,* Sure, *Levet,* you do deſign to get this Book by heart: *having often ſeen me reading of it. I can teſtifie alſo, that*

Dr. *Hollingw.* Charact. of K. *Charles.* *pag.* 9.

Royſton

Royston the Printer told me that he was imprisoned by Oliver Cromwell *the Protector, because he would not declare, that King* Charles I. *was not the Author of the said Book.* Signed *and sealed October* 16. 1690.

Will. Levet.

4. The next Evidence is that of Mr. *Royston*, which contains very material Circumstances *viz.* That *the* October *before, the King sent a Message to him to prepare all things ready for the Printing some Papers, which he purposed shortly after to convey to him, and which was this very Copy brought the Twenty third of* December *next following.* This is very near to a direct Evidence; and the King's sending to him to prepare himself, & this Book being sent to him accordingly, is a plain proof that these were the Papers the King designed to send him; and the King had intentions of Printing them in *October*, which it seems, according to Dr. *Walker* and Mrs. *Gauden* was before he had seen them, or heard any thing of them. I shall not need to add any more to this, but that this Testimony of Mr. *Royston* is corroborated by two others, as Mr. *Thomas Milbourn*, Printer by *Jewin-street*, who told Dr. *Hollingworth* before sufficient Witnesses: *That in the Year* 48 *he was an Apprentice to Mr.* John Grisman *a Printer, when Mr.* Simonds, *by Mr.* Royston, *sent the King's Book to be Printed, and that his Master did Print it. That Mr.* Simonds *always had the Name of sending it to the Press, that it came to them as from the King, and they understood it no otherwise; that they had Printed several other things with* C. R. *to them, and that it looked to them like the same Hand, and the same sort of Paper with others that were so marked, and looked upon as the King's Papers; for the King kept the Original by him, and Mr.* Odert *the Secretary transcrib'd them.* To the same purpose Mr. *Clifford*, Reader of Prayers at *Serjeants Inn* in *Fleet-street*, who assisted Mr. *Milbourn* in the Printing it: and who further adds, *That the King intituled his Book the* Royal Plea, *but Doctor* Jeremiah Taylor *coming accidentally to Mr.* Royston's *Shop, he having an assured Confidence in him, shewed him the first Proof from the Press, which when the Doctor viewed under that Title, he told him the Title would betray the Book——— That* Dr. Taylor *wrote to the King, to let him know it would be in Danger of suppressing by two Informers,* Chelsenham *and* Jones, *who would understand the Book by the Title: And therefore he thought* Εικων Βασιλικη *would be a better*

Dr. *Hollingworth's* Defence of King *Charles* I. *pag.* 12: 13, 14.

Title, and leſs taken notice of by the Informers, being Greek, and agreeing with the Title of his Father's Book, called Βασιλικὸν δῶρον *and to which the King conſented.* ——— And adds further, *That he never heard, nay, that he is ſure, that Dr.* Gauden *never was concerned in that Book by which* Milbourn *and himſelf Printed it, and that they had no part of the Copy from Dr.* Walker, *for it was that tranſcribed by Mr.* Odert *they Printed it by.*

To theſe Teſtimonies cited by Sir *William Dugdale*, and in this manner ſtrengthened and confirmed, we may add,

1. The Teſtimony of Doctor *Gauden* himſelf, when Biſhop of *Exeter*, and atteſted by Mr. *Long*, Prebendary of the Church of *Exeter*, viz. *That he had heard him often affirm, that he was fully convinced, that the* Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ *was intirely that King's Work.* This, I confeſs, is not a direct Proof to the Matter, but it is full againſt Dr. *Gauden*; for if he was fully convinced, that it was intirely the King's Work, he could himſelf never pretend to have any hand in the Compoſure of it.

Dr. *Walker*'s Account examined, *pag.* 4.

2. The Teſtimony of two Authors of two Books, and both of them printed 1649, whoſe Names I know not, tho poſſibly by the Titles of their reſpective Books they may be known to ſome other perſons.

The firſt is certainly a perſon of Worth and Learning, and the Title his Book bears, is Εἰκὼν ἡ πρὸ written in anſwer to a ſcurrilous Pamphlet againſt the King's Book, intituled Εἰκὼν Ἀλήθινη in which the Author (*pag.* 4.) hath theſe Words: *The Author might have informed himſelf of divers, who have ſeen the Original Copy, manuſcribed by the King himſelf, he might have ſeen it himſelf for asking.* ——— And afterwards, *I take it to be the King's Book, I am ſure of it, I knew his Hand, I have ſeen the Manuſcript, I have heard him own it.* Theſe are plain and expreſs, and if the Author was known, I doubt not but his perſon would give Value to his Teſtimony, for his Writings plainly ſhew him a great Man, and of excellent Qualifications.

The other is the Author of a Book called the *Princely Pelli*can, written on purpoſe (as the Title Page aſſerts) *to ſatisfie the Kingdom, that the King was the Author of this Book.* And the Account the Author gives of himſelf is this, (*Pag.* 1.) that he *had been a conſtant Servant to the King*, and that *he had remained conſtantly in his attendance upon his Majeſty to the laſt Man*, that *the King was oft-times pleaſed to communicate his private Councils and Addreſſes to him.* And after having

having given this Account of himſelf, he proceeds to give Account of the Book, and in the firſt place tells us the very Beginning of the King's Reſolutions to undertake it. (*Pag.* 4.) That *he was pleaſed ſome few days after he had retired from his Parliament, to communicate his Thoughts in his Garden at* Theobalds *to ſome of his Gentlemen who were neareſt to him, and of whoſe Intimacy and Abilities he ſtood moſt confident, how he had ſet his hand to Paper to vindicate his Innocency, in the firſt place, by ſhewing the Reaſons he had of receding from the Parliament. And that not ſo much as one Line had fallen from his Pen, which with Honor he might not confirm.* The Author goes on, *His next Eſſay, as he told us, he intended ſhould take its Diſcourſe from the faithfulleſt Servant, and incomparable States-man that any Prince could rely on,* meaning the Earl of *Strafford*, and then gives us the King's particular Diſcourſe, *condemning himſelf for ſuffering his Hand to thwart the Reſolution of his Heart*, &c. And particularly recites at large the Diſcourſes of his Attendants on that Subject with his Majeſty. He tells us further, (*Pag.* 19.) that the King told them, *That as his Morning Devotions took up the firſt, ſo he ever reſerved the next for theſe Meditations he had now in hand.* The Author yet further tells us, (*Pag.* 21.) That at *Naſeby*, *thoſe Divine Meditations were ſeized by the Enemy, with other Papers of Concern, being incloſed in a Cabinet reſerved for that purpoſe*: and that *by the Benignity of the Conqueror, or Divine Providence rather, it was recovered above all expectance, and returned to his Majeſty's Hand; and which infinitely cheered him.* And further (*Pag.* 22.) That a *Perſon of high Command in that Army gave this Cenſure of it, ſaying,* It was an handſome Piece of Hipocriſie. There are ſeveral other obſervable Paſſages in this Author too long to tranſcribe. And I heartily wiſh, we could recover the Author's Name. In the mean time, the Teſtimony which he gives does ſo agree with the thing it ſelf, and ſo concur in ſome Particulars, with the other Evidence before-mentioned, particularly the ſeizing the King's Book (ſo much of it as was then done) at *Naſeby*-Fight, and the Recovery of it again, and the great Joy the King had on the receiving it: that they plainly corroborate each other, and there can be no poſſible reaſon to doubt the Truth and Sincerity of ſuch Evidence, which at divers times, and upon ſeveral Occaſions, give the ſame Teſtimony, and in the ſame Circumſtances.

These are some of the Evidences which prove King *Charles* the First to be the sole Author of this Book, and which, I conceive, are so plain, full and clear, that it is impossible to avoid the Force of them, or without great obstinacy, not to be convinced by them. For, I think, there is very little need to bestow much pains in comparing the Evidence on both sides, and to shew which preponderates, and ought to determine us in a matter of this Nature. On the one side we have but one single Evidence (if we have that) to the direct Matter, and that is the Person himself about whom is the Controversie, and him also under the presumption of Advantage and Interest. And on the other we have several credible and unexceptionable and disinterested Witnesses, who neither had, nor could have any personal Advantage from the Evidence they give. On the one side we have two Witnesses giving their Testimony by Hearsay and Report, that they heard the pretended Author say so, *&c.* on the other we have far more for weight and number, declaring their proper knowledge of the Matter of Fact. On the one side neither of the two Witnesses come home to the direst Matter, or positively assert they saw Dr. *Gauden* write it, or dictate it, or saw it in his own Hand-writing, or any thing like it. But on the other, the direct contrary, some attesting they saw the King writing some part of it; others saw it in his own Hand-writing, and which they knew; and one, that he had the original Manuscript it self in possession, and given him by the King. On the one side we have one of the two Witnesses contradicting himself, and both contradicting each other in very important parts of their Evidence. On the other all agreeing, not only in the main Fact, but in several Circumstances, and in all the material Branches of their respective Testimony. And now, if Evidence must carry it (and I know no reason to the contrary) it is plain, that all the Advantage is on the King's side, and there is no manner of comparison between them. And sure 'tis very easie to judge on which side the Right lies, when plain, positive, direct and unexceptionable proof, is opposed only by intangled, indirect, contradictious Evidence, and full of Inconsistency.

I have now done with the first thing proposed, the *External Evidence*, proving the King to be the Author, and proceed to the next, *viz.*

2. The intrinsick Evidence, which arises from the Book it self: and if all the Testimony for King *Charle's* being the Author was set aside, this would be abundantly sufficient to determine the Matter, and would far over-balance all that has been

been ſaid in behalf of Dr. *Gauden*, and ten times as much more. The Truth is the Book diſcovers its own Author, and there is not a Line nor a Sentence but plainly owns the King's Hand, and as plainly confutes all the pretences for Dr. *Gauden*. But this is a copious Argument, and to manage it fully, would require a larger Book than that in Controverſie. And therefore I ſhall confine my ſelf, and ſpeak briefly to theſe Particulars.

1. The General Stile.
2. The Hiſtorical Part of it.
3. Some particulars of the Subject Matter of it.

1. The General Stile: By this I do not only mean the Phraſe and Expreſſion, but, together with that, the manner of Management; and to this I add, the great Weight of the Matter: all theſe are very great and Majeſtick, not only like a King, but like that very King to whom they are aſcribed; and let any Man compare this Book with other the Works of this glorious Martyr, and he cannot but ſee the ſame generous and free Expreſſion, the ſame Clearneſs of Reaſon, the ſame Greatneſs of Mind; in ſhort, the ſame Majeſty throughout. But for the Works of Dr. *Gauden*, there is nothing in the World more unlike; a luſcious Stile, ſtuffed with gaudy Metaphors, and fancy, far more Expreſſion than Matter, a ſort of noiſy and Romantic Eloquence. Theſe are the Ornaments of Dr. *Gauden*'s Writings; and differ as much from the Gravity and Majeſty of the King's Book, as Tawdrineſs does from a Genteel and Accompliſh'd Dreſs. The Truth is, of all the Authors of that Age, there ſcarcely any whoſe Writings more light & thin, than thoſe of Dr. *Gauden*; & let any Man compare the beſt of Dr. *Gauden*'s Writings with this Book, and do it with Judgment and Diſcretion, and I dare ſay, he will be perfectly cured, and he can no more believe, that Dr. *Gauden* was the Author of it, than he can believe, that the King's Picture at *Whitehall*, and that upon a Sign-Poſt, were both drawn by the ſame Hand. I know Dr. *Walker* talks fine things of a Man's *changing his Stile, and differing from himſelf.* (P. 25.) But when all the Peices put out in a Man's own Name ſhall be looſe, forc'd, ſtiff, and elaborate, and one ſingle one put out in the Name of another, incomparably great and excellent. This is ſuch a Change, as I believe, no Man is capable of, and no Man can give account for. The Force of this therefore does not lie only in the difference of Stile and Expreſſion, but in that total Diſparity that is between them in every thing; for tho a Man may vary his Stile, (which yet Dr. *Gauden*, by the ſeveral Subjects he hath written on, hath given no reaſon to think that he had

had a Talent that way) yet he cannot be Maſter of better and finer Thoughts when he pleaſes, or if he could, to be ſure, we ſhould ſee ſomething of them, or at leaſt, ſomething like them in the Works which wear his Name, and by which he deſign'd to communicate himſelf to the preſent Age and his Memory to Poſterity. Let a Man therefore who hath any Underſtanding in theſe things, compare this admirable Book with the genuine Works of Dr. *Gauden*, his *Sermons*, his Speech in the *Lords* Houſe againſt the *Quakers*, and his other Tracts, and then let him believe they have all the ſame Author if he can. This is ſo clear and convincing, that nothing ought, nothing can defeat it, but the moſt plain and invincible Proofs. He that ſays, that Dr. *Gauden* is the Author of the King's Book, lies only under this one Diſadvantage, that he ſays what *is incredible* in the nature of things, and according to the common Rules of judging. And if ever he expects to convince reaſonable Men, he muſt produce ſuch Evidence, ſo clear, full, and without Exception, and of ſuch undoubted Veracity, and Authority, as Men may reſigne up their Judgments and reaſons to the Teſtimony. In ſhort, there was in that Age and in the Reign of that Pious Prince many Great and Learned Men in all Faculties, (and without any diſparagement to him, or to his Memory) in all reſpects far ſuperior to Dr. *Gauden*. And yet I believe, any Man who will carefully, and with attention peruſe this Book, and impartially judge when he hath done, he will conclude, that no Subject the King had was able to write this Book, and none leſs qualified for it than Dr. *Gauden*.

2. The Hiſtorical Part of it.

And here I ſhall not need to obſerve, that this excellent Book contains the moſt remarkable Paſſages of State from 41 to the middle of 48, and that not only the outward Shell, or the meer Facts, but the ſecret Springs by which they were moved; here we have the Riſe and Growth of the ſeveral Factions, the Steps that they made, the Intrigues they managed, with moſt wiſe and judicious Remarks upon them, which plainly denote the Author to be an excellent *Stateſman*, of a clear and penetrating Judgment, and well vers'd in the Affairs he wrote on; eſpecially if we add thoſe Matters perſonally relating to the King; which (conſidering his various Fortunes and Removes, and particularly after *Naſeby*-Fight, and his Removal to the *Scots*, and from thence to *Holmeby*) I queſtion whether any one ſingle Man in *England* could have given, not only ſuch an Account, but any clear Account at all. The Myſtery of his going to the *Scots* is plainly laid open in that Chapter *of his leaving*

Oxford

Oxford, *and going to the* Scots, wherein are his Majeſty's Reaſons for ſo doing. And in the next Chapter are as plainly inſinuated the propoſals that were made to him of *Sacrilege*, and the Attempts made upon him to *gain his Conſent againſt his Conſcience*, &c. The Truth is, all the *Meditations* are weav'd into a Form of Devotion, and ſo they do admirably expreſs the Piety and Goodneſs of the Compiler: but they are withal Hiſtorical, and give the beſt Account of the Myſtery of Iniquity that then reigned, together with a more exact Judgment concerning the ſeveral Particulars, than is yet extant in any other Book. All which do very well agree with the Character of King *Charles* the Firſt. But how to reconcile them to Dr. *Gauden*'s Character, is (I think) an inſuperable Difficulty. For as to his Faculty at Hiſtory, and how judicious a Compiler he was, we have (as far as I know) but one ſingle Inſtance, and that is the Life of Mr. *Hooker* wrote by him, and prefix'd to one Edition of the *Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, and which (to ſay no more) is certainly the moſt injudicious Hiſtory of a Man's Life that ever was written. There are ſo many palpable Miſtakes and Falſhoods ſo very little to any purpoſe of Hiſtory, ſo lean, jejune and empty Accounts of the Man, whoſe Life he undertook, than it plainly betrays a Defect in every neceſſary Qualification of an Hiſtorian; and it is written without Care, or Diligence, or Judgment. But I had rather leave this to the Readers own Eyes, then extend it further; and if he pleaſe to compare this Book and that Life together, let him judge for himſelf, and if, after that, he can poſſibly believe they have both one and the ſame Author, he is abandoned to the utmoſt degree of Eaſineſs and Credulity, and may believe any thing in the World.

3. Some Particulars of the Subject Matter. And theſe I ſhall mention are ſuch things as could only be known to the King himſelf, and conſequently could have no Author but him.

As 1. His ſecret Intentions.

2. The Matters of his own Conſcience.

1. His ſecret Intentions. Theſe are expreſſed all over the Book, I ſhall only ſelect two or three Paſſages, which contain not only his ſecret Intentions, but his Appeals to Heaven for the Truth of them. In the Chapter *on the Inſolency of the Tumults*, ——*God who is my ſole Judge, is my Witneſs in Heaven, that I never had any thoughts of going from my Houſe at* White-Hall, *if I cou'd have had but any reaſonable fair Quarter.* And in that Chapter *Upon his Retirement from* Weſtminſter,

I may

I may in the Truth and Uprightneſs of my Heart, proteſt before God and Men, that I never willfully oppoſed or denied any thing that was in a fair way, &c. And again in the Prayer; *Thou knoweſt, O Lord, how unwilling I was to deſert that place in which thou haſt ſet me, and whereto the Affairs of my Kingdom at preſent did call me. And upon the Liſting and Raiſing of Armies, God knows, I had not ſo much as any hopes of an Army in my thoughts.* And *upon the Troubles and Rebellion in* Ireland, *If I have deſired or delighted in the woful days of my Kingdom's Calamities, if I have not earneſtly ſtudied, and faithfully endeavoured the preventing and compoſing of theſe Bloody Diſtractions, then let thy Hand be againſt me, and my Father's Houſe.* And many others of the like nature, and which, I think, I ſhall not need to make any Remarks upon, only deſire the Reader to tell me, whether he thinks theſe are the Expreſſions of King *Charles*, or of Dr. *Gauden*, or whether he can beleive that Dr. *Gauden* durſt make ſuch *Appeals* and *Imprecations* upon Fictions and Forgeries? If he does believe that Dr. *Gauden* durſt do this, I am certain he can beleive nothing that Dr. *Gauden* aſſerts, nor can he believe Dr. *Gauden* if he ſhould appeal to Heaven, and imprecate the Divine Vengeance concerning the Truth of his being the Author of this Book. For he that can appeal and imprecate upon one Forgery, may do ſo upon a hundred.

2. The next thing I have to obſerve, is a Matter relating to the King's Conſcience, and of a high Nature. 'Tis in the Caſe of the Earl of *Strafford*, where the King plainly charges himſelf as guilty of his Blood, by giving his Conſent to that Bill which took away his Life. In that Chapter *upon the Earl of* Strafford's *Death*, the King ſaith, *He preferred the outward Peace of his Kingdoms, before that inward exactneſs of Conſcience before God.* And adds, *I am ſo far from excuſing or denying that Compliance on my part (for plenary Conſent it was not) to his Deſtruction, whom, in my Judgment, I thought not,* by any clear Law, *Guilty of Death; that I never bore any Touch of Conſcience with greater Regret,* &c. Again, *It is a ſad Exchange to wound a Man's own Conſcience, thereby to ſalve State-Sores.* And ſpeaks of his own Guilt in this manner, *Being in my Soul ſo fully conſcious; theſe Judgments God hath pleaſed to ſend upon me are ſo much the more welcome, as a means (I hope) which his Mercy hath ſanctified ſo to me, as to make me repent of that unjuſt Act, (for ſo it was to me.)* And the King adds, that *nothing more fortified his Reſolutions againſt all thoſe Opportunities to gain his conſent to* Acts *wherein his Conſcience was unſatisfied, than the ſharp Touches he had for*

what

what passed him in my Lord Strafford's *Business.* Further yet the King saith, *That he was better assured of his Guiltlessness then any Man living could be.* Again, *this Tenderness and regret I find in my Soul for having had any Hand (and that unwillingly God knows) in shedding one Man's Blood unjustly.* And in the Prayer are these Expressions: *But thou, O God of infinit Mercies, forgive me that Act of sinful Compliance, which hath greater Aggravations upon me than any Man ——— Deliver me from Blood-guiltyness, O God ——— Against thee have I sinned ——— for thou saweſt the Contradiction between my Heart and my Hand ——— while I was perswaded by shedding one Man's Blood to prevent After-trouble, thou hast for that, among other sins, brought upon me, and upon my Kingdoms, great, long, and heavy Troubles.* And now I would ask any Man living, whether he thinks these are the Expressions of Dr. *Gauden*? whether Doctor *Gauden* did, or possibly could know the inward State of the King's Conscience? or if he did, whether he would in this manner, publickly, and in Print, have charged the King in downright Terms with acting against his Conscience, and in the Case of Blood? or finally, whether any Man, besides the King himself, would, or indeed could have aggravated his Guilt in such a manner, *That he was better assured of my Lord of* Strafford's *Guiltlessness than any Man living could be.* That *his sinful Compliance had greater Aggravations upon him than any Man.* That the Calamities *upon him and upon his Kingdoms* were upon the score of *that among other sins*? These are evidently the breathings of a sincere, and generous Repentance, and plainly shew that the King was not ashamed to give Glory to God, by a frank and open Confession of his Faults, with all their aggravating Circumstances. But my Business is not to vindicate the King's Virtue and Piety, which does not need it, but to shew that he was the Author of this Book. And which these Expressions do very convincingly, and beyond contradiction, and that no other Man could be the Author. And if after this any Man can believe, that these are Fictions and Chimera's made to the King's Hand, and not proceeding from the Heart of a penitent Prince himself, under the deep and painful sense of Guilt, it is high time to leave disputing and offering any more Reasons to them whom no Reason will convince, nor Truth satisfie.

And thus I have done, with what I have at present to say, in this Controversie, and hope it may tend to the satisfaction of unbyass'd and unprejudiced Men. I confess a great deal more might be said, especially in the latter part, and with re-

ſpect to the *intrinſick proof*. The Book it ſelf affords many Arguments, and of equal force with theſe, which convincingly evidence that the King, and the King only was the Author of it; but I thought it ſufficient to point out theſe few, which may ſerve for a Handle to any judicious Reader to obſerve many others of the ſame Weight and Importance.

I know but of one Objection more, and that reſpects a Prayer added to ſome Editions of the King's Book, as uſed by the King, and ſaid to be taken out of a Romance, *&c*, Now, altho I know no manner of harm in this, and the Objection is plainly peeviſh and querulous; for why may not a Man uſe good Expreſſions in his Prayers, let them be borrowed from whom they will, as well as a good Sentence out of a Heathen Writer, and which was never any Blemiſh, tho on the moſt pious Occaſions, yet there is great reaſon to believe, that the King did never make uſe of it, for that it is not found in the *Firſt*, nor in ſeveral other the moſt early Editions of this Book. And for the Readers ſatisfaction in this Point, I have here ſubjoin'd a Catalogue of the ſeveral Editions of it, both without & with the Prayers, Collected with great Care and Induſtry, by Mr. *Keeble* at the *Turks-Head* in *Fleet-ſtreet*, & printed on a ſheet of large paper, to bind with the King's works; & for preventing any Miſtake, he hath with great Exactneſs given the Size of each Volume, the Time of Printing, the Number of the Pages that the Contents conſiſt of, and the Number of the Pages of the Book it ſelf, when there were any ſuch. And in which it is obſervable, that there are no leſs then Twenty eighth Editions without the Prayers, and Seventeen of them Printed 1648.

But ſince the firſt Edition of this *Vindication*, I have receiv'd full and convincing Information concerning the Myſtery of this *Prayer* that it was an Artifice of *Bradſhaw*, or *Milton* or Both, and by them ſurreptitiouſly thruſt into the King's Works, to diſcredit the whole. This Information comes originally from Mr. *Hill* the Printer, but convey'd by two very worthy Gentlemen, and againſt whom there can be no poſſible Exception; Dr. *Gill* and Dr. *Bernard*, who both were Phiſitians to him, and very intimate with him and becauſe their Teſtimony is ſo very important the Reader ſhall have it in their own words, from a Letter of Dr. *Gill* to the Honorable *Charles Hatton* Eſq; at the End of which is added, the teſtimony of Dr. *Bernard*, and which I have now in my Cuſtody. And is as follows *verbatum*:

May

May 1ſt. 1694.

SIR,

I moſt readily comply with your Requeſt in informing you from whom I heard what I was ſaying (the laſt time I had the honour to be in your Company) That I was told Pamela's *Prayer, was transferr'd out of Sir* Philip Sidney's *Arcadia into* Εικων Βασιλικη *by a contrivance of* Bradſhaw's *and* Milton's. *Sir I make no ſecret of it, and I frankly tell you my Author, who was Mr.* Henry Hill Oliver's *Printer, and the occaſion, as he many years ago told me, was this, Mr.* Dugard, *who was* Milton's *intimate Friend, happen'd to be taken printing an Edition of the King's Book,* Milton *uſed his intereſt to bring him off, which he effected by the means of* Bradſhaw, *but upon this Condition that* Dugard *ſhould add* Pamela's *Prayer to the aforeſaid Books he was printing, as an attonement for his fault, they deſigning thereby to bring a ſcandall upon the Book, and blaſt the Reputation of its Author, purſuant to which deſign they induſtriouſly took care afterwards as ſoon as publiſhed to have it taken notice off. Mr.* Hill *hath affirm'd this to me ſeveral times of his own knowledge, and I need not tell you how eaſy it was for him to know it, who being a forward, and confiding man was in moſt of the intrigues of that time, and intruſted with buſineſs of the greateſt privacy by the then governing Partys, and no man, that I have met with was better vers't in the Secret Hiſtory of that time than himſelf, as I have found by the often diſcourſe I had with him, for being his Phiſitian for ſeveral years, I had many opportunities to talk with him about thoſe affairs, from whom I have received a different account of the tranſactions of thoſe times, than what was commonly known or made Publick, and many paſſages that I was a ſtranger to before. Thus Sir I have given you my Authority, for what I ſaid, which if you pleaſe, you may communicate to the Reſt of our Friends and beleive me alwaies*

Your moſt humble Servant

Tho. Gill.

I do remember very well that Mr. Henry Hills *the Printer told me that he had heard* Bradſhaw *and* Milton *laugh at their inſerting a Prayer out of Sir* Philip Sidney's Arcadia *at the end of King* Charles's *his book and then* Milton *had jeer'd it in his anſwer, adding withall that they were men would ſtick at nothing that might gain their point and this I teſtifie.*

May 10th. 1694.

Francis Bernard.

An Account of the ſeveral Impreſſions, or Editions of King CHARLES *the Martyr's moſt Excellent Book, Intituled* Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ, *that have been Printed both without and with the Prayers at the End.*

Theſe 28 *of the firſt Impreſſions or Editions of the King's Book, are Printed without the Prayers.*

THE Firſt Impreſſion in 12° Printed *Anno Dom.* 1648. laſt Page 187. Contents one Leaf at the end.
The 2d. Imp. in 8°. Prin. 1648. laſt pag. 269. Cont. 2 Leaves.
The 3d. Imp. in 8°. Prin. 1648. laſt pag. 269. Cont. 3 Leaves.
The 4th. Imp. in 12°. Prin. 1648. laſt p. 269. Cont. 3 Leaves.
The 5th. Imp. in 12°. Prin. 1648. laſt pag. 269. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 6th. Imp. in 8°. Prin. 1648. laſt pag. 268. Cont. 2 Leaves.
The 7th. Imp. in 8°. Reprinted in *R. M.* 1648. laſt pag. 268. Contents two Leaves.
The 8th. Imp. in 8°. Prin. 1648. laſt pag. 270. Cont. 3 Leaves.
The 9th Imp. in 8°. Prin. 1648. with only the Lady *Elizabeth's* Relation laſt pag. 302. Contents two Leaves.
The 10th Imp. in 8°. Print. 1648. the laſt pag. 242.
The 11th. Imp. in 8°. Print. 1648. laſt p. 302. Cont. 2 Leaves.
The 12th. Imp. in 8°. Reprinted for *James Young* 1648. laſt pag. 268 Contents two Leaves.
The 13th. Imp. in 12° Prin. 1648. laſt pag. 164. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 14th. Imp. in 12°. Prin. 1648. laſt. p. 187. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 15th. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1648. laſt p. 225. Cont. 2 Leaves.
The 16th. Imp. in 24° Print. 1648. laſt p. 342. Cont. 2 Leaves.
The 17th. Imp. in 24°. Print. 1648. no Figures, Cont. 2 Leaves.
The 18th. Imp. in 8°. Print 1649. laſt p. 204. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 19th. Imp. in 8°. Print. at *Paris* Engliſh 1649. laſt pag. 196. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 20th. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 264. with Epitaphs.
The 21ſt. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 195. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 22d. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. (in Latin) laſt p. 272. with Apothegms.
The 23d. Imp. in 12°. Print. at the *Hague* by *Sam. Brown* 1649. (in Latin) laſt pag. 272. Cont. 2 Leaves.

The

The 24th. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. at the *Hague* for *Williams* and *Eglesfield* (Latin) laſt p. 272. Cont. two Leaves.
The 25th. Imp. in 12°. Print. (in Latin) 1649. laſt p. 258.
The 26th. Imp. in 12°. Print. with the Works 1649. laſt p. 182.
The 27th. Imp. in 24°. printed at the *Hague* by *Sam Brown*, 1649. laſt p. 318. Cont. 4 Leaves.
The 28th. Imp. in 8°. Print. for *R. Royſton* 1681. laſt pag. 256. Cont. 1 Leaf.

Theſe 27 of the Second Impreſſions or Editions of the King's Book, Printed with the Prayers.

THE Firſt Impreſſion in *Octavo*, Printed 1648. laſt Page 270. the Prayers added in 1649.
The 2d. Imp. in 24°. Print. 1648. laſt p. 354.
The 3d. Imp. in 24°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 436. Cont. 2 Leaves with the Additions of the Prayers.
The 4th. Imp. in 8°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 258.
The 5th. Imp. in 8°. very large. the beſt Printed 1649. the laſt p. 263. Cont. 2 Leaves.
The 6th. Imp. in 8°. Prin. 1649. laſt p. 236. with Apothegms.
The 7th. Imp. in 8°. Printed 1649. laſt p. 247. Prayers added.
The 8th. Imp, in 8°. Print, 1649. laſt p. 269. Cont. 3 Leaves.
The 9th. Impreſſion in 12°. Print. 1649. with Apothegms.
The 10th. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. in Dutch.
The 11th. Imp. in 12°. Printed 1649. in French, laſt p. 442. Contents one Leaf and half.
The 12th. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. in French. laſt p. 269. Cont. two Leaves, with ſome of his Works.
The 13th. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 230. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 14th. Imp. in 12°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 260. Cont. 1 Leaf.
The 15th. Imp. in 24°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 226.
The 16th. Imp. in 24°. Print. 1649. laſt p. 175.
The 17th. Imp. in 24°. Printed in 1649. laſt p. 354.
The 18th. Imp. in 8°. Print. at the *Hague* by *Sam. Browne*. *Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ* the Works of King *Charles* the I. without date. Laſt pag. 119.
The 19th. Imp. in 8°. Printed at the *Hague* by *Sam. Browne* 1651. laſt pag. 324.
The 20th. Imp. in 8°. of the King's Works in 2 Vol. Prin. 1659.

The

1534
8

The 21ſt. Imp. in 24°. Print. at the *Hague* by *Sam. Browne*. in 1649. the King's Works.

The 22d. Imp. in 24°. Print. in 1651. with the King's Works.

The 23d. Imp. in 24° Reprinted in 1649. *Reg. M.* laſt pag. 281 Contents two Leaves.

The 24th. Imp. in 12°. of the King's Works Print. in 1650. at the *Hague* by *Sam. Browne*, with divers of His Majeſtys Prayers, whereof the three laſt uſed by him in the time of his Reſtraint, were delivered to the Biſhop of *London*, at his death, from whom they were taken away by the Officers of the Army: And amongſt theſe ſix Prayers that entitled to be ſaid in Time of Captivity, and taken out of Sir *Phillip Sidney's Arcadia* is not one of them, however it came to be printed in ſome of them.

The 25th. Impreſſion in *Folio* being the whole Works of King *Charles* the I. and by Order of King *Charles* the II. Printed in 1662: for *R. Royſton*.

The 26th. Imp. in 8°. large Printed in 1685. laſt pag. 272. for *R. Royſton*.

The 27th. Imp. in Folio being the whole Works of King *Charles* the I. and by Order of King *James* the II. Printed in 1686.

FINIS.

132773